INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 3. (NEW SERIES.) MARCH, 1896. Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	65
The Jingo Revival, by A. E. Fletcher	71
The Indian Outlander, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	72
Judicial and Executive Functions in India, by A. Nundy	74
The Secretary of State's Drafts, by W. M. W.	76
Political and Social Reform in India	77
Correspondence: The Congress and the Anglo-Indian Press	80
The Opening of Parliament	81
The Chitral Amendment: The Nescience of Lord G. Hamilton	82
Railways in India: A Heavy Financial Loss	84
Our London Letter	85
The Chitral Debate: Division List	87
"The Chitral Blunder"	87
The Máháraja of Jhalwar	88
The Judiciary and the Executive in India: Memorandum by the British Committee	90
The Ninth Social Conference: Text of the Resolutions	91
Reviews: The Story of the Deccan	92
"The Valley of Kashmir"	94
Mr. Harold Spender's Story	96
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	96
Recent Official Publication	96

Indiana.

India and the Queen's Speech.

The Queen's Speech, which was delivered by the Lords Commissioners to both Houses of Parliament on February 11th, contained, contrary to custom, more than one paragraph relating to India. "On the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire, the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral have been," so "my lords and gentlemen" were assured, "successful, and the engagements entered into by the border tribes for the maintenance and protection of the road from Peshawar have been loyally carried out without molestation or disturbance." The phraseology of this announcement is curious and important. It was understood, or, to speak more strictly, it was stated last year that the expedition which was sent to Chitral was intended solely to relieve Dr. Robertson. The Viceroy's proclamation to the people of Swat and Bajaur expressly declared that as soon as that object had been attained the force would be withdrawn. "There is," the proclamation added, "no intention of permanently occupying the country passed through." This language contrasts oddly and significantly with "the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral." More than that, the Queen's Speech declared that the measures in question were taken "on the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire." Is Chitral, then, in the opinion of the present Cabinet, on the frontier, and not beyond it? If so, when and how was the frontier extended to Chitral? And was the procedure which was adopted in accordance with the Act of 1858? Section 55 of that Act provides as follows:—"Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by Her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues." When was this consent obtained? And will the Government kindly state—for it appears to know—where exactly "the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire" now is? The Indian taxpayer, who bears the brunt of the "forward" policy, will compare, not without bitterness, the language of the Queen's Speech, 1896, with the language of the Queen's Proclamation, 1858:—

QUEEN'S PROCLAMATION, 1858.	QUEEN'S SPEECH, 1896.
We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions; and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others.	*On* the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral have been successful.

The remarkable thing is that, in the opening debate on the Address, the Liberal leaders made no mention of the reversal of their policy in Chitral by their

successors. Lord Rosebery, in the House of Lords, and Sir W. Harcourt, in the House of Commons, delivered speeches which surveyed the world from China to Peru, but neither of them had one word of protest to utter against "the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral." Are we to assume that the Liberal leaders have not the courage of their convictions? Or is justice to India a matter of no importance in their eyes?

The Chitral Amendment.

It was left for Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., and his colleagues of the Indian Parlamentary Committee to do what Sir Henry Fowler ought to have done. On February 17th, Sir William moved an amendment to the Address in the following terms:—

"But we humbly express our regret that the present Government, reversing the policy of their predecessors, have decided not to withdraw from Chitral, thereby violating the pledge expressly given in the Viceroy's proclamation, dangerously adding to Government responsibilities beyond the north-west frontier of India and inevitably leading to an increase of the overgrown expenditure in the Indian Military Department, and, further, our regret that the treaty of 1893 with the Amir of Afghanistan has not been placed before Parliament."

The sudden collapse of the debate on Venezuela caused the Chitral amendment to be reached earlier than had been expected, with the result that Sir W. Wedderburn's seconder and many other members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, to whom a "whip" had been issued, were not in their places. A less unfortunate result was that there was a good House to hear the irresistible logic of facts which Sir W. Wedderburn presented in a pithy and pointed speech. He knew, of course, that the best he could hope for was a moral victory, and that victory he easily obtained. Lord George Hamilton, alike by the manner and the matter of his defence, confirmed the strength of Sir William's position. The Secretary of State for India is neither an orator nor a debater, and the weakness of his arguments was not by any means concealed by the strength of lung with which his party "items" backed him up. In fact, Lord George was rather angry. He asserted that Sir W. Wedderburn "had not mastered the rudiments of the question," that he was "absolutely wrong," that his case was a pure concoction from beginning to end," and that it was "not based on one iota of fact." Cabinet ministers have hitherto left pleasantries of this kind in the undisputed possession of the baser sort of attorney. What Lord George Hamilton utterly failed to show was that any one of the contentions put forward in the amendment was contrary to fact. Those contentions were:

(i) That the retention of Chitral violates the pledge given in the Viceroy's proclamation;
(ii) That it angerously adds to Government responsibilities beyond the north-west frontier; and
(iii) That it must inevitably lead to an increase of Indian military expenditure.

The Discomfiture of Lord G. Hamilton.

How did Lord George Hamilton meet these contentions? One has only to read his speech carefully through to see that he made no pretence of meeting them at all. Let us take the third point—the increase of expenditure—first. Unlike former apologists for the policy of occupation, Lord George Hamilton admitted that some increase was inevitable. He merely expressed the hope that it would be "less than was anticipated." What this hope is worth may be judged from the examples cited by Sir W. Wedderburn—the Abyssinian war, which was estimated at three millions, cost 10 millions, and the Afghan war, which was estimated at $1\frac{3}{4}$ millions, cost 21 millions. As to the first two contentions—that the policy of retention is a breach of faith, and is dangerous—Lord George merely evaded them. He did, indeed, state that the Viceroy's proclamation "had absolutely nothing to do with the people of Chitral," but that statement only leads us to doubt whether Lord George Hamilton has ever read the proclamation. It is to be found at page 39 of the Chitral Blue-book, and it contains two distinct undertakings:

(i) "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and prevent any future, unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and, *as soon as this object has been attained, the force will be withdrawn.*"

(ii) "The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes."

Now, it is obvious that the first of these two promises is a promise *to withdraw from Chitral*, and it does not matter whether it was addressed to the people of Swat or the people of Timbuctoo. But we go, as they say in the House of Commons, one step further. The date of this Proclamation (see Blue-book, p. 39) is March 14th. It was issued on the receipt of Sir H. Fowler's telegraphic despatch, No. 25 (Blue-book, p. 34), in these terms:

"I am prepared to approve such action for securing safety of Robertson and party as you may deem necessary."

Moreover, when, on March 15th, the Viceroy informed Sir H. Fowler that orders had been issued for the mobilisation of the first division of the field army, the latter at once telegraphed:

"Please let me know why so large a force is considered necessary for securing safety of Robertson and party."

Three days later the Viceroy replied:

"Large force is required on account of necessity for holding line of communication in great force, and to meet possible hostility of both Mohmands and Swats and other frontier tribes."

There is not a word here about the policy of occupation which Lord George Hamilton now declares "has been an unmixed success." It is an unmixed breach of faith, and no irrelevant talk about the richness of the country or the docility of the people can obscure the fact. We deal more at length with the question elsewhere. Here we will only express our astonish-

ment at the fact that Sir Henry Fowler, whose policy was so hastily reversed by Lord George Hamilton, was absent from both the debate and the division on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment. The amendment was supported by 79 members—a notable increase on the 28 who voted in the same sense with Mr. Maclean last September. The people of India will observe with amusement, though without surprise, that Mr. Bhownaggree, who voted for Mr. Maclean's amendment in September, voted against Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment on February 17th.

Danger Ahead in Chitral.

We have not done with Chitral yet. Notwithstanding the optimism of the Queen's Speech, and the confident declaration of Cabinet Ministers that the occupation of the country will not add a rupee to Indian military expenditure, authorities who are able to take a closer view bid us look out for squalls. The *Pioneer*, for example, commenting on the forthcoming Budget statement, wrote on January 23rd that on the expenditure side there is one huge item for which provision was not made :—

"We refer to the cost of the Chitral Relief expedition. This has been commonly taken at two crores of rupees, and it certainly will not exceed this, for the figures now work out to about 193 lakhs. . . . . If we mistake not, some 22 lakhs only were budgeted for last March on account of Chitral. So that the expenditure of between 120 and 180 lakhs must be classed as extraordinary. As we said some time ago, the improvement in exchange and the saving under the head of opium will enable the Government to bear this heavy war charge with equanimity."

The equanimity of the Government, which calls the tune, is one thing ; the distress of the taxpayer, who pays the piper, is another. Extravagance in the military department of the Government of India finds its natural counterpart in the high rate of the salt-tax, in oppressive enhancements of land revenue, in the starvation of public works, and the neglect of education. Nor is that all. The *Pioneer*, in its issue of January 16th, points out that, although the congeries of tribes beyond the Peshawar border have hitherto remained on their best behaviour since the withdrawal of the Field Force, "in the spring the reality of their apparent acceptance of the new position will be tested." The *Pioneer* adds :—

"In the arrangement made with the Swat elders and the Khan of Dir it was distinctly laid down that the troops moving to and from Chitral would travel by the new road, and no surprise, therefore, will be sprung upon the tribesmen when the reliefs are ordered. The question is whether the re-appearance of our Sepoys marching from Chakdarah to Drosh will cause any unrest among the fanatical section of the population, and whether any attempt will be made to intercept the regiments as they move from post to post."

We are warned that "one can never be certain as to the temper of the tribes, or as to what outside influence may be at work," and already a postal runner has been killed.

Mr. Bayard on Moral Force.

At a time when the cheap heroics of the music-hall and of our newest Poet Laureate are so obtrusive, it is refreshing to come across a speech so sane and wholesome as that which Mr. Bayard, the American Ambassador, delivered at the Whitehall Rooms on February 6th. Mr. Bayard is no idolater of militarism. He sees a nation's ultimate strength not in material but in moral force :—

"The hearts of men who love England have been lately stirred to consider the true forces of England—how England should be continued and strengthened. The common and patriotic turn of thought has been to the armed forces, to your great ships, to your brave army, to the stout hearts and to the earnest consciences of your people ; but, believe me, there are other forces that make and keep a people that are not noisy, though all the more powerful. (Cheers.) Therefore to-night I venture to ask your special attention to the most important sources of the strength of your country, which, by making your country strong, shall make mine strong also. (Cheers.) I mean those fountains of moral force which are the true basis of the world's advancement and forward movement. (Cheers.)"

These unexceptionable sentiments, as we see, excited popular applause. But there are, doubtless, cynical persons who will reflect that Mr. Balfour also excited popular applause when he laid down the startling maxim that where the British soldier has set his foot, there he must remain—a maxim, by the way, which Lord Salisbury seems to have overlooked in Siam. Even soldiers like Lord Roberts are ready to avow—in their speeches—that Great Britain holds, and can only hold, India by the ties of justice, not by the power of the sword. But there is sometimes so glaring a contrast between words and deeds. At any rate, the British army in India is not reduced, while we demonstrate our moral force by violating our proclamation in the case of Chitral. On paper, again, Dr. Jameson's raid is condemned. But it seems to have had the effect of attracting an unprecedented degree of attention to the grievances of the Uitlanders ; whereas Ireland, as Mr. Dillon points out, is said to be indifferent to Home Rule because she refrains from outrage. Mr. Bayard's lesson, we fear, is not yet fully learned in this best of all possible worlds.

A Specimen "Moral Effect."

We turn from Mr. Bayard's remarks to the account which is given by the *Pioneer* of the operations in Lushai-land. We called attention in January to the despatch of a punitive expedition to this territory, which during the past few years has, without apparent cause, increased by more than eight millions of rupees the military expenditure of the Government of India. "The band," says the *Pioneer*, "enlivened the departure by playing a selection of inspiriting tunes, which were frequently interrupted by the ringing cheers of the sepoys, who thus testified their joy at finding themselves

once more on the war-path." The expedition seems to have lived up to this spirited beginning:—

"On 26th December we offered the following terms to the Chiefs Kairuma, Jaduna, and Kaphleya. Kairuma, whose village is by far the largest, numbering over 500 houses, was to pay a fine of 80 guns, Jaduna and Kaphleya between them 60 guns, and these latter were further informed that they must send 80 coolies to work for 10 days at Fort Tregear. The fines were to be paid on the 29th. Should they fail to obey these orders, on the 30th parties would be sent out to harry the people and burn the rice. In order to carry out this work of destruction the more efficiently, it was decided that the Burma column, consisting of six officers and 100 rifles, should join us here on the 27th."

There was some delay in bringing in the guns, and the "rice-destroying operations" began. But the expedition soon found "more congenial work" in hunting an "old enemy," Jacopa, at Mwellon. The gallant expedition, not deterred from their quest by "five men who were apparently busy catching rats for their supper," easily found and arrested Jacopa and, while the officers took tea, the men "hunted around for spoils to carry away as momentoes of the night's work." The edifying story proceeds:—

"At 1.45, an hour and a half after we had so cautiously sneaked into the village, we boldly and victoriously marched out of it having previously fired all except three of the houses. These three we spared, as a brother of the man who had so ably guided us to Jacopa's retreat lived in one of them, and we could not be so ungrateful as to burn his house with the rest, so found we also had to spare those on either side, as they were also so close together, that if one were fired it would burn the other also. We left the blazing village with a hope that it would serve as a warning to all of the fate that was in store for all villages which harboured our enemies."

On the return journey our brave warriors were "hampered with the various articles" which they had "brought away as momentoes". But they got safely back, without being startled by any more rat-catchers, and "as no more guns had been brought in, we had to again send forth parties to destroy grain, and this time a large quantity was burned." The closing reflection is sublime:—

"Though of fighting there has been none, and we have not had any opportunity of showing them our superiority in that way, yet we have shown them that the power rests with us, and I fancy the moral effect produced . . . . is one that will not soon pass away."

It is perhaps a pity that these inspiriting descriptions of British valour on the war-path do not find their way into English newspapers. They might tend to abate our humiliation in respect of Armenia.

Uitlanders and India. The article which Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., contributed to our last number upon "Uitlanders and India: The Mote and the Beam," should be read in connexion with Mr. Chamberlain's despatch to President Kruger, suggesting a scheme of Home Rule for the Rand, and the recent debates on the Transvaal question in the House of Commons. Whole passages from the speeches and the despatch apply *mutatis mutandis* with far greater force to the taxpayers of India than to the Uitlanders in the Transvaal. The latter have, at any rate, migrated to a country not their own, and their claim is that the constitution of that country should be so modified as to give them a share of civic authority. With the taxpayers of India the case is different. In their native land they are debarred from any real and effective control over the expenditure for which they are compelled to make provision. Can we wonder that educated Indians resent their disabilities, and the insolence which is sometimes added to them? "We can," Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta said at Bombay last December, "represent the great masses of the people, and we can enunciate their grievances and the measures for redressing them. We can ask for a reduction of the salt tax in their interest; we can ask for a lighter assessment of the land; we can ask for them economy and reduction of expenditure, and we can point out that nothing is more responsible for squandering the revenues of the country than the military policy which has again come into favour since 1884-85." But with what sort of answer are such representations met? Are they welcomed by the ruling class, which absorbs every year in salaries and pensions so large a tribute from the Indian people? On the contrary, they are too often received with contumely, and their authors denounced as agitators and sowers of sedition. Is it not strange that the British public should be so tender to Uitlanders, who foment armed invasion of the territory of a friendly State, and so indifferent to the moderate demands of our Indian fellow-subjects in their own country? "Unfortunately," said Mr. Chamberlain on February 13th, amid ironical cheers from the Irish members, "in all these matters we are living, as it were, in a glass house." We are indeed. But no good can come of closing our eyes and ears against facts. "It is not in our power," Mr. Chamberlain said, "to protect the Republic of the Transvaal from internal weakness; and there will be internal weakness so long as the causes of discontent remain." What is true in this sense of the Transvaal is true also of India. But the policy of military bureaucrats not only ignores internal discontent but actually aggravates it by squandering Indian resources upon costly measures of futile defence far beyond the frontier.

The Judiciary and the Executive. A Memorandum upon the Separation of Judicial from Executive (especially police and revenue) Duties in India has just been issued by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress to members of both Houses of Parliament. Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., has also forwarded to the Secretary of State for India a copy of the document, which contains, in

addition to Mr. Ghose's statement, the series of authoritative opinions contributed to our columns by Lord Hobhouse, Sir Richard Garth, Sir Richard Couch, Sir J. B. Phear, Sir R. T. Reid, Sir William Markby and Sir Raymond West. The scheme of separation suggested by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt in India for August, 1893, is also included, and the compilation is prefaced with a brief introductory note which we reproduce on another page. The immediate object of the publication is to draw attention to what has long been a burning question in India. If it should fail to accomplish this purpose, further steps will be necessary, and will undoubtedly be taken. There is not a word to be said in favour of the existing system. It would not be tolerated for a moment in the United Kingdom, and the many scandals to which it has given rise tend to cast discredit upon the general administration of justice in India. The reform of a system under which the policeman and the detective is also the judge is demanded alike by public opinion in India and by every authority who is concerned for the good name of the Judiciary. The modest suggestion of the British Committee is that a practical experiment should be made in a single division, where the "counsel of perfection," as Lord Dufferin called it, could be adopted without any risk of large increase of expenditure. It is not easy to see what plausible answer, except a ready affirmative, can be given by the India Office to so tentative and practical a proposal.

The "New" Diplomacy.

After the "new" journalism, the "new" drama, and the "new" woman, we have now the "new" diplomacy. The inventor, it is almost superfluous to say, is Mr. Chamberlain. The "new" diplomacy has the defects of its qualities, but it is, on the whole, much better than the old. Even the *St. James's Gazette* has vouchsafed a word of commendation to Mr. Chamberlain's refusal to stand upon the ancient ways:—

> "As for frankness in the publication of documents, the Colonial Secretary admits that he has carried it to the verge of indiscretion. It is, as he said, a new method of diplomatizing. For our part, we think it is a good one. There is too much mystery and moonshine, too much reticence and false pretence, about our public affairs altogether. In these days, when sooner or later the nations have to decide great issues, it is just as well that the nations should know, whenever it is possible, what their rulers are doing, and what they intend."

Anglo-Indian journals, please copy. Secrecy and silence have hitherto been two of the most important and, we must add, the most sinister weapons of the Government of India. Mr. Chamberlain's publication of his scheme of Home Rule for the Rand gave offence to President Kruger, because the scheme had not previously received his approval. "If," said Mr. Chamberlain, "I have done wrong, it is a lesson to persons who endeavour to diplomatize on new methods; but, at all events, I shall be discharged from any imputation of bad faith in the matter." Exactly; and the usefulness of publicity in the ninety-nine cases is worth the risk of a *contretemps* in the hundredth. Mr. Balfour, in his speech at Manchester last January, bore significant testimony to the excellence of the method. At the close of his remarks upon the Venezuelan question, he said:—

> "Surely, with all this mass of material before the public of both countries, it will be hard indeed if the common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race is not able to settle any point in dispute without the arbitrament of war."

The "new" diplomatist who had recourse to publicity in that case was not Lord Salisbury, but President Cleveland—a fact which rather increases the significance of Mr. Balfour's testimonial. The "new" diplomacy is also ready to do justice to Civil Servants. Mr. Chamberlain, in the House of Commons on February 13th, mentioned by name, and with expressions of high praise, Mr. Fairfield, of the Colonial Office, who, he said, "knows, I fancy, more about South African affairs than probably any other living man." It is one of life's little ironies that, while the able civilian remains concealed in the background, the case which he has prepared, or the report which he has drawn up, is presented, and badly presented, by some tedious figurehead in the House of Commons.

Sir H. Fowler at Wolverhampton.

When Sir Henry—or, as he then was, Mr.—Fowler was appointed Secretary of State for India in the spring of 1894 we wrote:—

> "Among other characteristics which have gone to make Mr. Fowler's reputation is his scrupulous anxiety to conciliate opponents. If he is hardly a conspicuous exponent of the *fortiter in re* he has cultivated sedulously the *suaviter in modo*. . . . . But there is a point at which conciliation and compromise, besides disarming opponents, begin to alienate supporters. . . . . In dealing with the India Council and the Government of India a new broom that wishes to sweep clean is likely to meet with a minimum of support and a maximum of opposition. The velvet glove is, in these circumstances, worse than useless unless it covers the iron hand. It has been said of Mr. Fowler that he will never initiate a great policy or lead a forlorn hope. Perhaps this judgment is a hasty generalisation from particulars. Now, at any rate, Mr. Fowler has an opportunity of refuting it."

Sir Henry Fowler, as the people of India learned to their cost, did not seize the opportunity. On the contrary, when he left the India Office he was, if possible, less of a Liberal than when he entered it. The question which is now being asked is whether, in any true sense, he can be called a Liberal at all. At the end of January, for the first time since the General Election, he addressed the Liberal Association in his constituency. We venture to think that the speech was, in some ways, the most remarkable of all the speeches which were delivered in the recess. For the lessons which Sir Henry Fowler

drew from the defeat and rout of the Liberal party last summer were :—

(i) That where the Government rests on a popular basis, you cannot legislate in advance of public opinion; and

(ii) That a system of Parliamentary groups is dangerous to party government.

Now, these propositions are, in themselves, not merely true, but truisms. They are akin to the proposition that two straight lines cannot enclose a space. But to deduce them as the lessons, and the sole lessons, of the Liberal defeat is, of course, to give away the Liberal case. The contention of Liberals was, we thought, not that Parliamentary groups or attempts to legislate in advance of public opinion compassed the downfall of the late Government, but that its strength was undermined by the cankering influence of a policy of obstruction in the House of Commons supplemented, and therefore encouraged, by a policy of destruction in the House of Lords. If Sir Henry Fowler is prepared to give away himself and his late colleagues in this reckless fashion, we cannot be surprised that, after a silence of six months' duration, he had not one word to say either about Lord George Hamilton's dealings with the cotton duties or about the retention of Chitral by the present Government.

"The Aims of the Congress."

"For the East India Association, which has somehow earned the reputation of allowing an official bias to govern its proceedings, to convene a meeting for a discussion upon the Indian National Congress is (writes a correspondent) an encouraging sign. A paper was read before a crowded meeting on February 17th by Mr. A. Nundy on the Origin, Aims and Objects of this organisation, the chair being taken by Sir Lepel Griffin. The retired Anglo-Indian element mustered pretty strong, amongst those present being Mr. Justice Pinhey, Messrs. H. Thornton C.S.I., J. B. Pennington, A. K. Connell, A. Rogers, J. Vaughan Morgan, J. Woodrow, C. V. Chapman; Drs. G. W. Leitner, C.I.E., H. R. Cook, G. Oswald; Surgeon Lieut-Colonel Ince, Lieut-Colonel Wintle, Rev. G. C. Reynall and others. Young India was represented by a large contingent. Sir Lepel Griffin in his introductory remarks cleared away two misapprehensions. The one was the commonly accepted belief that the East India Association would not allow a subject to be discussed which did not bear the stamp of official approval, and the other was the opinion, assiduously propagated by certain Anglo-Indian journals, that the Indian National Congress was mainly composed of disappointed men, and raw youths fresh from the Universities, before they settled down in life. The chairman gave it on his authority that 'any question in which a large part of the most educated and intelligent of the Indian people took interest came within the scope of the discussions of the Association.' Mr. Nundy in his paper first showed the utter falsity of the allegation that the educated classes were disloyal and disaffected. They recognised and appreciated the good that British rule had done in India by introducing for the first time greater security of life and property, pure administration of justice and immunity from foreign invasion, which alone demanded the gratitude of the people. If for no other reason than the selfish one that they were not prepared to govern the country themselves, they felt how impolitic it would be to weaken the Government which held together the heterogeneous masses. There were, no doubt, exhibitions of dissatisfaction and discontent, but for these British rule was solely responsible. On the one hand it had brought the people into contact with Western civilisation, granted them a liberal education, freedom of speech and a free press, while on the other hand it had refused to grant them a share in the administration of their country. To all thoughtful minds, Mr. Nundy contended, it was evident that the Government was not in touch with the people, who, on their side, owing to diversity of race, religion and habits, were unable to co-operate with each other for their common benefit. The National Congress was thus started, the object being to bring together all the conflicting elements, and to combine them in one harmonious whole, to act as the medium of communication between the Government and the people of India, and to consolidate the union between England and India by securing the introduction of such reforms as were desirable in the interests of the nation.

A Chorus of Approval.

"Mr. Nundy showed," our correspondent continues, "that these objects have to some extent been realised. Hindus, Christians, Parsis, Jains, and even some Muhammadans, are now heartily co-operating with each other, and the mass of the Muhammadans would, he contended, undoubtedly have joined but that they fell an easy prey to the policy formulated by some Anglo-Indian administrators of *divide et impera*, and thought that they could make capital out of the displeasure by which Hindus were then overshadowed. He denied that the demands of the Congress were extravagant or unreasonable and, taking up resolution after resolution approved by the Congress, showed that some of the demands had already been granted, though partially, while as regards others their reasonableness had been recognised by the Government, or by public opinion in India and in England. An animated discussion followed Mr. Nundy's paper. It had two distinguishing features. Some of the young Indians

present—aptly termed, by the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, the unorthodox supporters of the Congress—were strongly in favour of the adoption of a more assertive attitude towards England, without, however, hinting at the existence of any feelings of disloyalty, whilst the Europeans present displayed a general approval of the paper read by Mr. Nundy, who was warmly complimented and thanked, especially by the chairman, for the temperate and able manner in which he had dealt with facts that were interesting in themselves and of value in promoting the good government of the country. This absence of criticism on the part of the retired officials, who are naturally looked upon as experts, proved in a sense unfortunate. If they had spoken strongly no doubt the Jingo press would have given greater prominence to the subject."

THE JINGO REVIVAL.

By A. E. FLETCHER.
Editor of the "New Age."

The old Manchester school of politicians, notwithstanding their "devil-take-the-hindmost" theory of economics, rendered services to the cause of international peace and goodwill which ought not to be forgotten. It is deeply to be regretted that the stalwarts of that school have left no equally sane and eloquent successors to speak forth the words of truth and soberness at the present crisis when Jingoism is once more in the ascendant. Doubtless, if such men were in the House of Commons to-day, and took the same independent line that Cobden and Bright took not only against Toryism, but against official Liberalism in 1853 and again in 1857, they would incur the popular odium and the defeat which those great statesmen fearlessly risked, but they would exert an influence which would speedily smash the present Government in spite of its big majority. The jingo fever is fortunately not a lingering disease, and Lord Salisbury might be turned out of office next year if we had an opposition inspired by men of such high character and calm wisdom as they who led the Radicalism of the last generation to victory with the watchwords of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform." If Lord Salisbury's administration were to collapse next Session like a house of cards, the occurrence would not be unprecedented. Lord Palmerston was carried into office on a wave of "Rule Britannia" enthusiasm in 1857, when he secured one of the biggest majorities on record, yet his Government did not last for two Sessions. He was defeated in the House of Commons in 1858 by a majority of nineteen. Both Cobden and Bright were rejected at the General Election of 1857 which turned on the question of the iniquitous China War. That a vast majority of the electorate should have approved of Lord Palmerston's swaggering policy on this question is to me as great a mystery as that an attempt should now be made to promote the apotheosis of the persons chiefly responsible for the crimes recently committed in the interest of Stock Exchange gamblers by the Chartered Company's filibusters in South Africa. But, as Mr. Bright said at the time of the outbreak of the Crimean war, nations like individuals occasionally go mad. We can only charitably assume that it is some kind of national madness which approves of the recent proceedings of the Salisbury Government. When the country recovers its senses it will undoubtedly condemn the annexation of Chitral, the needless invasion of Ashanti, and the contemptible plot to annex the Transvaal. English "Society," which is simply another name for organised greed and gambling, seems for the moment to have hypnotised the democracy into an approval of the Government's "spirited" policy on colonial and foreign questions. A reaction, however, would soon come if we had men to lead and inspire us. It is perfectly evident that an attempt will be made to give the filibuster Jameson an ovation. The best we can say of this young man, who is the mere tool of Cecil Rhodes and Company, is that he may have been deluded into the belief that he was going to the relief of the wronged and the suffering. Nobody, however, who knows anything of the method of procedure of the Chartered Company will accept this assumption without a smile. No sane person can now believe that Dr. Jameson's employers acted out of pure philanthropy. The attempt of the Jingoes to create ill-feeling against the Boers because of their shyness in giving the franchise to the Outlanders is very amusing. Mr. Balfour, in his recent speech at Manchester, while mildly condemning the Jameson fiasco, was unable to conceal his sympathy with the organisers of the raid. Mr. Balfour took occasion to lecture President Kruger for failing to adopt in its integrity the good old constitutional doctrine that taxation and representation go together. Mr. Balfour is a leader of the party which has persistently opposed the adoption of that principle. Isn't it sheer hypocrisy for English statesmen to lecture the Boers for refusing to enfranchise the Outlanders (who are not the best company to be met with in this world) while our Parliament at home is not elected on the widest possible franchise, and while we refuse representative Government to the whole of our fellow-subjects in India? When we cease to hold down the Indian people by the throat, and make an honest attempt to give them some control over the enormous revenues which we raise from them, it will be time enough for us to advise

President Kruger to redress the grievances of the Johannesburghers.

We cannot expect, however, that anything will be done to allay the present jingo fever or to reverse the "forward" policy which the Government have been pursuing in Asia, Africa, and America until we get men in Parliament who will be able to rouse Liberalism from its lethargy. The Liberal party can never become an inspiring force again so long as it acquiesces in the wanton waste of needless millions upon armaments, or so long as it fails to protest against the madness of extending our military frontier and contracting our moral position. A Cobden or a Bright is much needed just now to brave both official and popular wrath in denouncing this costly folly. We want men who will dare to raise such a storm as these great apostles of political righteousness and peace raised forty years ago. Perhaps no two men ever made themselves more unpopular than Cobden and Bright did at the time when the nation's brain was turned at the prospect of a war with Russia. They were sneered at and jeered at by the classes, and publicly hooted and insulted by the masses. Priests tried to preach them down, and poets denounced them as cowards and traitors. When we remember that men of genius like Tennyson and Sidney Dobell caught the jingo fever in the middle of the century, we need hardly be surprised that our music-hall laureate should have been similarly afflicted at the end of it. But notwithstanding Alfred Tennyson's sneers about "the broad-brimmed hawker of holy things," and Sidney Dobell's charge that Cobden and Bright wanted to save the blood of their countrymen "to reserve it for their blushes," the line which these great leaders, with but few followers, took was the right one. After all, enthusiasm for righteousness is more permanently contagious than jingoism, and it was not long before Cobden and Bright were able to exercise an influence strong enough to upset the jingoes of the fifties, and bring back the nation to the condition of the man clothed and in his right mind. Would that politicians of the stamp of these mighty prophets of peace and goodwill were amongst us to-day.

THE INDIAN OUTLANDER.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

The Uitlander of the Transvaal, persistently befooled and put off by the carefully self-regarding Government of the Boers, has at last had serious attention drawn to his grievances. The list of these, Mr. Chamberlain acknowledges, is "formidable in length and serious in quality." The Uitlander is many times as numerous as the Boer. Yet he cannot obtain naturalisation and the franchise except on conditions so onerous as to amount to practical denial. He cannot get efficient education for his children in the State or State-aided schools. He suffers gross extortion in taxes and tariff; and his industry is crippled not only by imposts but by absurdly restrictive conditions. The finances are mismanaged; the expenditure escapes proper control and audit; the taxation is beyond administrative needs; unfair discrimination is shown in the collection of personal taxes; the import duties on the necessaries of life are at once a hardship on the working class, and a clog, frequently prohibitive, on industrial development. Exceptional legal restrictions are placed upon the right of public meeting. He is crushed by monopolies as regards mining requisites and other important articles of commerce. He suffers from vexatious formalities and needless restrictions, as well as the absence of needful restrictions, in respect of mining labour. The railways are managed, in regard to personal and traffic arrangements, not in the general interest of the community, but for the financial advantage of the Government. The Uitlander is excluded from the police force by burgher prejudice, although the burgher population "cannot possibly be expected to furnish adequate material from which to select candidates for this department of the public service." A list of formidable length and gravity, no doubt. Mr. Chamberlain proposes for the Rand the remedy of Home Rule.

Other remedy there is none, consistently with the continued predominance of the Boers in the Transvaal. The Irish will not be deterred by Mr. Balfour's incidental distinctions from enforcing the argument in its application to Ireland. And what of India? Is there not an Outlander question of much gravity simmering and menacing in India? Why, the Indian populations are all Outlanders in their own country! The list of their grievances, if drawn up with equal frankness by Lord George Hamilton, would be seen to be no less "formidable in length and serious in quality" than Mr. Chamberlain's Uitlander list. We took India by the sword—the sword of our adventurous Dr. Jamesons —and by other means of less honourable quality than even the sword; and we stuck to our takings, and have not scrupled to extend them with ingenious industry. True, the sword is now theoretically rusting in the scabbard, and men in high places talk impressively of trusteeship, moral influence, and even religious responsibility. They turn up the whites of their eyes, like President Krüger. Like President Krüger, they conclude with a *non possumus* to urgent demands of reasonable rights. It is to be earnestly hoped that the further parallel may induce some more practical regard for the just rights of this Outlander population in their own land.

Just let us see how the facts stand on a few of the points. Take the question of representation. Well, there is the India Councils Act of 1892. That Act, no doubt, was something to be thankful for, with all its imperfections. It provided, in a way, that the voice of the country should have an opportunity of making itself heard in the Legislative Councils. But the method of election is an indirect

method, very obnoxious to Englishmen when applied in their own affairs. The representative delegates are elected, not by the people directly, but indirectly by their elected representatives for other purposes; and it is no wonder that the method creates great and general dissatisfaction. Besides, the right even of this indirect election is arbitrarily given and withheld. It was the only other day that Lord Sandhurst sensibly redressed the grievance of exclusion under which the very important central division of Bombay, including Poona and Satara, rested under the *régime* of Lord Harris. In the North-West Provinces and Oudh, the forty-four District Boards are grouped in two groups, each group having the right to send one member, while only 10 out of the 103 municipalities are judged fit to be entrusted with the privilege. The Punjab actually has no legislative council at all, nor yet the right of sending a representative to the Viceroy's Council. Why? "Is it," asked Bakshi Jaishi Ram, at the Madras meeting of the National Congress, with justifiable bitterness, "Is it because the people of the Punjab shed their blood in 1859 against their own people, and secured the glory of the British Crown by fighting in the fields of Abyssinia or other foreign countries? Or is it because for the present the fighting tribes are supplied in great measure from the Punjab? Or is it because the frontier crisis is some day to be decided by the people of the Punjab?" Mr. Gladstone looked forward to a very different result—"not merely to a nominal, but to a real living representation of the people." Lord Salisbury, on the other side, said: "If we are to do it, and if it has to be done, of course accepting that it must be done, let us do it systematically, taking care that the machinery provided shall effect the purpose of giving representation, not to accidentally constituted bodies, not to small sections of the people here and there, but to the living strength and vital forces of the whole community of India?" Yet the official framers of the rules under the Act have thwarted the intentions of Parliament and of the leaders of the two great parties with an efficiency all but parallel to the procrastination of President Krüger.

Take again the case of education, and follow it out to the practical results. Early in the century, the decision was finally taken to educate the people, and one can only regard with amazement the actual dubiety of the governing class on the subject. It is only recently, however, that anything has been done towards the establishment of places of technical education, while the literary education in all the grades leaves enormous scope for expansion. The Universities are mere shells. Industrial colleges—there are none in Calcutta or in Madras, and the one in Bombay is languishing for sheer lack of funds. Mr. Master, speaking before the National Congress at Madras in 1894, with full technical knowledge and with experience of the country, did not hesitate to say this: "With all the raw material at our very door, with all the evidence of skill the Indians have shown in arts and manufacture, the sight of the country depending upon other countries for almost all manufactured articles is to me, I say, somewhat dreadful." The cry of the intelligent people is for a steady and efficient expansion of education in every form, in order to bring them mentally abreast of other nations, and to enable them to develop successfully the industrial resources of the land. The Government, to which it is inevitable that they should turn their eyes, no doubt potters over the business in a well-intentioned fashion; but it is impossible to acknowledge that the people receive in this respect anything like such satisfaction of their wants as they are justly entitled to expect. Such spread of education as has already been attained is not fairly allowed to have its proper recognition in the administrative departments of Government. The Simultaneous Examinations fiasco shows a deliberate official contempt of the natural expectations raised by the Queen's Proclamation and confirmed by the progress of intelligence among the people. Sir Thomas Munro, we are told by Sir A. J. Arbuthnot, "attached little value to schemes for improving the education of the natives, unless *pari passu*, steps were taken for extending to them a greater share in the honours and endowments of office." Munro was wiser than most of his successors, foreseeing that education must inevitably find a practical issue in the government and administration of the country, else it would inevitably lead to troublesome, and to dangerous, discontent. There will, in fact, be no real satisfaction until our governing officials see eye to eye with Sir Charles Napier. "We must mix with the people," said Sir Charles Napier, "give them justice, give them riches, give them honours, give them share in all things until we blend with them and become one nation. When a half-caste or a full native can be Governor-General, we shall not hold India as a colony or conquest, but be part inhabitants, and as numerous as will be required to hold it as our own." The rising Salar Jungs, Dinkur Raos, Madhava Raos, and the rest, must be permitted as free a career under the Government of India as in the Native States. The extravagant reluctance of officialism to recognise irreversible facts can only work mischief. For, as Mr. James Routledge well put it, "we have opened to India a new door, a new life of knowledge, and the strongest arms in the world never again can close the door."

It is needless, after recent discussions, to do more than refer to the crushing weight of expenditure, not merely as against revenue, but in regard to the true development of the energies of the country. Nor need the over-riding of the opinion of India on such matters as the cotton duties be agitated anew. If India had been allowed to act for herself, she would not for a moment have allowed her infant textile industry to be crippled in favour of the cotton magnates of Lancashire. If native statesmen had any influence in the councils of the nation, can it be believed for an instant that they would squander lakhs and crores of rupees on a barren frontier that can well defend itself, while more than fifty millions of the population habitually drag out a wretched existence on the verge of starvation? If we look at the judicial service, we shall find grievances in plenty clamorous for reform—a reform that must await the pleasure of an officialdom interested to avert any change—a reform of evils that have been frankly

admitted by Liberal and Conservative Secretaries of State, that are removable without fresh expense, and that nevertheless remain in vigorous operation. Let these indications suffice. In spite of all distinctions that may be drawn between the Transvaal Uitlander and the Indian Outlander, there unhappily remain only too many and too serious points of substantial community. The essential considerations that weigh with Mr. Chamberlain in his suggestions for the mitigation of the Johannesburg difficulty ought to weigh much more heavily with Lord George Hamilton. There is no demand that everything should be done with a rush. But it concerns both India and England very materially that reasonable requirements of reform should be promptly and fairly considered, and be met with reasonable and timely concessions. Thereby we should save a vast amount of futile waste, and strengthen the position at all points, were it only by the elimination of weakening and rankling elements.

THE SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS IN INDIA.

By A. Nundy.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose, in the valuable statement which was published in "India" for December has furnished a very fair idea of the evils which beset the combination in one person of Executive and Judicial functions. Mr. Ghose professes to speak only for the Bengal Presidency. Now, for a variety of reasons Bengal contrasts most favourably with other provinces. It enjoys a great many advantages which are denied to some of the other provinces. The Permanent Settlement, Trial by Jury, superior education, and the existence of a public opinion, though not in a very pronounced form, constitute safeguards which are utterly wanting in some of the other provinces, whereas there is an absence of some of the inducements and some of the opportunities which lend themselves in other provinces (such as the North-Western Provinces and the Central Provinces, of both of which I have personal experience) to officers exercising executive functions to interfere with the due administration of justice. In the Central Provinces, which is still what is called a non-regulation province, as also are Oudh, the Punjab, Assam, and the Berars, the district officer is invested with much larger judicial powers than in the regulation provinces. He has the power of inflicting a fine to any extent, and of sentencing the accused to an imprisonment not exceeding seven years. It will be seen how immense these powers are, and what unlimited scope an officer possessing such powers has of abusing his functions if he wishes to do so. But it is not the district officer alone who is likely to, or does as a matter of fact, abuse his position. The combination of these two functions leads men holding very feeble authority indeed to show that they can exercise that little authority to the detriment of others. The *tehseldar* (revenue collector), the lowest revenue officer, who also exercises judicial fuctions as a magistrate, can just as much become an engine of oppression as a more highly placed official.

In the greater part of Bengal the Permanent Settlement prevails. If the annual revenue to which the Government is entitled is not duly paid by a zemindar, the property, after the requisite notice, is put up for sale. The law does not permit, and the officials do not show, any consideration. The zemindar has full knowledge of the consequences of his becoming a defaulter. No favour is asked, for none can be given. No coercion is used, for none is necessary. But in the provinces where periodical settlements prevail, matters are very different. The revenue may be remitted in part, or its payment delayed at the will of the collector. Ordinarily, however, this officer has to collect all the revenue he can—in fact, his success as an official depends on the proportion of the total land revenue of the district he is able to send in to the Government treasury. As to his efficiency as a judicial officer, I do not think the Government gives it a thought when it makes the selection of an officer to take charge of the district. The revenue must be collected somehow. The *tehsëldar* exercises all his ingenuity to get the hundreds of the zemindars in his *tahseel* to pay in the revenue, and if, in the course of so doing, he or his subordinates exercise a little coercion or a little intimidation, who is to question him or call him to account? He knows he has complete immunity for what he does whilst he is discharging this, the most important, part of his function. Any complaints to his superior officer will simply be thrown into the waste-paper basket, or, if the zemindar has the temerity to lodge a complaint in any of the criminal courts, it will have to be heard by officers who are themselves exercising this dual function, and are all subordinate to the district magistrate, who is, at the same time, the collector of the district. In the course of the twenty years during which I have been practicing at the Bar I have on several occasions been consulted by men who have suffered indignities or been maltreated by the revenue officials. My advice to them has always been to sit quiet and forget what has transpired, for I felt sure that anyone resorting to legal proceedings in a matter of this kind would be a marked man, and would have eventually to suffer for his temerity. It would have been otherwise, if these complaints could be heard by a tribunal exercising judicial functions only, and not subordinate to the district magistrate. The cases could have been tried on their merits and the appeal heard by the district judges, who, I must admit, do not allow themselves to be influenced by extraneous considerations, but confine themselves to merely adjudicating upon the question whether the conviction is borne out by the evidence or not.

But it is not only in the collection of the revenue that breaches of the law are committed, whilst the prospect of obtaining relief is but small. The district magistrate is responsible for the peace of the district. In his executive capacity he often receives information that a certain person is likely to disturb the peace—information which is one-sided, is often based on calumny, or supported by police officers who may be misinformed, or may have some object in getting the person concerned into trouble. He calls upon this person to show cause why he should not be bound over to keep the peace. He has then

two alternatives before him: either to try the case himself or to send it for trial to a subordinate magistrate. If he takes the case on his own file, and, in his judicial capacity, records evidence in the case on which alone he is supposed to decide it, how can he help being biassed? How can he divest himself from all previously received impressions, and from the information which led him to form an opinion that it was proper to institute proceedings against this man? Thus with the best intentions he may err, and cause a miscarriage of justice. It is not he that is to blame, so much as the system of which he himself is the victim. But the other alternative, to my mind, is by far the worse so far as the supposed offender is concerned. The case is sent for trial to a subordinate magistrate, who proceeds to hold a judicial inquiry. He is by no means a free agent. He has not merely to decide the case upon the evidence adduced before him, for other considerations creep in. Ought he to dismiss a case which has been sent over to him by the district magistrate, who must, he thinks, have good reason for desiring the man to be bound over? What if by dismissing the case he were to incur the displeasure of his official superior, on whom alone his chances of promotion depend? Then, again, in cases of this kind the district magistrate is the Appellate Court. What, the subordinate magistrate thinks to himself, will be the result if the matter is brought before the Appellate Court? An appeal from a conviction, he with good reason surmises, would be hopeless, whilst in case of an acquittal the district magistrate may, either at his own instance or at the instance of the other party, commence proceedings in revision, and cancel the order and send the case for trial to another magistrate. The safest and easiest way out of his difficulty is for him to convict. Such cases are by no means uncommon. I once appeared in a case where two brothers were called upon to show cause why they should not be bound over to keep the peace towards each other. The district magistrate at first issued an informal notice to them in his executive capacity. He heard both sides, and eventually decided that my client was to be proceeded against. I frankly admit that I would much rather that he had heard the case out himself; but he sent it to a subordinate magistrate, who, in utter disregard of all the evidence produced before him, which went to show that not my client, but his brother, was the aggressor, bound him over in a heavy sum to keep the peace.

I may here allude to what has been my experience, and is the experience of other barristers and pleaders, that in certain instances we would much prefer a case to be heard by a European rather than by an Indian magistrate. An Indian magistrate, unless he is a Covenanted Civilian, cannot help being swayed by the views of a district magistrate. He cannot completely dismiss from his mind what might be the consequences to him if he were to act contrary to the wishes or inclination of his superior officer. I have frequently applied under instructions from my client that a particular case be sent for trial to a European magistrate, and often with the full consent, and sometimes even at the instigation of the Indian magistrate to whom it would otherwise have been sent. An amusing instance of how a European magistrate was above being influenced by the views of his official superior occurred in my own experience in the Central Provinces. A case was sent by the district magistrate to a subordinate European magistrate with the remark, not demi-official, but on the back of the police *chalan* "I hope the magistrate will inflict the severest sentence he can," which meant in this case two years' imprisonment and 1,000 rupees fine. The case was heard by this magistrate and, as the evidence for the prosecution had absolutely broken down, I duly informed my client he was sure of an acquittal. To my surprise the magistrate read out a judgment convicting the accused and as a climax inflicted on him a fine of eight annas; The magistrate afterwards told me: "You know that your client is an old offender, and doesn't care a rap for his character for he has none" (which was the truth), "I could have acquitted him but I wished to show the district magistrate he had no business to dictate to me what sentence to pass in a case. I, therefore, convicted your client and sentenced him to a merely nominal punishment."

It is a very suggestive fact that we never hear any complaints of any outside influence being brought to bear on the subordinate judges of the Civil Courts. The reason is obvious. The district judges never interfere with the subordinate courts in the discharge of their duties. They are not even aware what cases have been instituted or are being heard by these courts. Sometimes it happens that a district judge sends for a judge subordinate, but it is always to enquire from him something with reference to a case which had already been decided by him and which was then pending in the appellate court. Even this practice is growing rare. The subordinate magistrates are, however, differently circumstanced. They are frequently called up by the district magistrate, who talks to them, and advises them on cases pending before them, and sometimes even dictates to them what sentence to pass. In a case in which I appeared for the defence the magistrate whilst trying it practically admitted that only a technical offence had been committed, but, much to my surprise, he inflicted on my client a sentence of imprisonment. He advisedly made it, however, long enough to be appealable to the district judge. He afterwards admitted to me that, if left to himself, he would have imposed a mere nominal fine, but that he was prevailed upon by the district magistrate to pass a sentence of imprisonment. The sessions judge, on appeal, acquitted the man altogether. The relative positions of the subordinate judges and of the deputy magistrates will be apparent from the fact that for anything improper done by the former the district judges send a report against them not to the Local Government but to the High Court, whereas the district magistrate in his executive capacity reports his subordinates to the Local Government. How, then, is it possible that these magistrates can conscientiously discharge their duties when their fate is entirely in the hands of the executive officers? Place them on the same footing as subordinate judges, and I have no doubt their work will be equally commendable with that of their brethren in the civil department.

Again, these magistrates have not only to please the district magistrate, but also the police officers who conduct the prosecution in all cases sent up by them. Go to the court of any deputy-magistrate in the North-Western Provinces and you will see barristers and pleaders outside the Bar conducting their cases, whilst on the bench the police officer, often only a sub-inspector, is seated by the side of the presiding magistrate and whispering to him, or coaching him, as to what he is to do. Often before the case is called up, the police officer has been closeted with the magistrate, who sometimes very innocently discloses the fact that he has a more extensive knowledge of the case than could have been obtained from the proceedings recorded by him in open court. In Bengal these practices may be rare, but in the North-Western Provinces they are so common that they excite no comment. That such practices are neither legal nor necessary is evident from the fact that in trials before the Sessions Court they are not resorted to, nor would they for a moment be tolerated. The deputy-magistrates are helpless in the matter, for if they ignored the police officers, these would at once complain to the district superintendents of police, who would report the matter to the district magistrate, who in his turn would soon call these magistrates to account. Superintendents of police have not hesitated to send up a report against district judges, when these officers have found themselves obliged to order an acquittal in a large number of cases, which is of course looked upon as a great reflection on the police work.

The combination of Executive and Judicial functions is a great blot in the government of India by England. In the interests of the people, in the interests of the magistrates, and in the interests of government itself, the sooner these functions are separated the better it will be for all concerned.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S DRAFTS.

HOW SHOULD THEY BE SOLD?

This question is one that at first sight relates to the technicalities of exchange, and to ways that are peculiar to the money market. Hence the "experts" in those regions claim to answer the question in the only way that suits their customs, class prejudices, and monetary interest. What is more, those potent persons whose pecuniary purposes are primarily served by the present plan whereby the Council bills are, in effect, sold to the lowest bidders, appear to have constrained the financial authorities of the India Office to accept their method of conducting these enormous weekly transactions. Those authorities, we may be quite sure, are anxious in the interest of India to get the best price for the drafts; and seeing that they have for long accepted the dictum of the money market in this vital matter of current finance, we must suppose that they have been convinced against their will. It would, therefore, be presumption on our part to hope that we could show them a more excellent way of selling heir orders for silver (new token rupees) in the n dian Treasuries. At best we can only raise the question; but in doing so there is both motive and influential precedent in excuse of our temerity. First as to motive—saving or gain on behalf of the Indian taxpayer. If but one halfpenny more could be obtained for each of the six millions of rupees that are now being weekly sold by the Secretary of State through the money market, that would be a gain of £12,500 at this end, representing a saving of nearly a lakh and a half in India. As to precedent, we can claim the intention and expressed desire of the last Indian Secretary to devise some method by which the India Office could take its right position as the master, instead of the slave of the money market. These are the remarks on the subject made by Sir Henry Fowler, in his speech on the Indian Budget:—

> "A matter about which I was very much exercised when I was in office was the mode in which these bills are sold. I was not satisfied that the Indian Government got the full market price for what they had to sell. The Secretary of State is the only seller of the commodity, and there is only a limited number of buyers; and, whether right or wrong, I arrived at the conclusion that the buyers had a good deal to do with fixing the price which was offered. Had I been in office, I should have devoted a considerable amount of further attention to the question, with a view to ascertaining whether some better mode of selling bills could not be devised. I know that the question is beset with difficulties, and possibly in the first instance it may be advisable to appoint a Departmental Committee to consider the question."

Since these remarks were made the anomaly has been accentuated which had very reasonably puzzled Sir Henry on the business side of his mind—namely, the apparent enormous excess of demand over the supply of these bills offered. About the time when these brief Budget debates took place (August and September) there were instances of an aggregate of tenders exceeding by four, five, or six times the amount of bills offered. And, under the date Wednesday, 5th (two weeks before these remarks are written), we find in the City articles such lines as this: "Silver firm at 30⅝d., the market being stiffened by the large application for India Council drafts this afternoon, which were again on a 'record' scale"—that is, for the sixty lakhs of bills offered by the India Office there were applications tendered to the amount of 622½ lakhs—that is, more than ten times (apparent) demand for the (visible) supply. And, as indicated above, in the week previous there had been a similar demand, out of all proportion to the supply offered.

In the case of any other commodity or security one would expect the demand quickly to adjust itself to the restricted supply by some sharp and appreciable addition to price. But, somehow, this does not happen in the case of the Secretary of State's orders on the Indian Treasuries for disbursement of rupees.

Even the City editors themselves expect that the normal effect—increased price causing check in demand—will follow on this apparent eager competition. For we note on these occasions such remarks as these: "The silver market was firm, owing to the larger applications for India Council drafts;" "The allotment of Council drafts was again favourable and the silver market strengthened under its influence;" and so on. Be it noted, in passing, that it is

silver that goes up as the effect "that is seen" at the time of these rushes for the Secretary of State's drafts, *not* appreciably the price of the drafts themselves. Yet there is also a certain fractional gain to the India Office Treasury, which may be traced in the smaller amount of tenders that secure the minimum rate (fixed beforehand) and the larger portion of tenders, that "receive in full" at such extra prices as the India Office, with its slavish dread of "the City," ventures to claim under favour of the rush for bills. But this extra price is very small. It may be traced in the rates at which "special sales" of bills are made after the total amount offered has been disposed of. Thus, in that week of tenfold demand, the "special sales" were only at $\frac{1}{16}$d. more than the ruck. It should be mentioned here that the other mode of adjustment, increase in supply, is timidly tried by the India Office; that it is since September that sixty lakhs per week have been offered instead of fifty. Here we may be reminded that we are venturing too much into technical details; but less would not serve, even if this suffices, to explain to the general reader the inside of this habitually obscured subject.

Now we will greatly dare in proceeding to set out what appear to us the principles and essential conditions that define and control the scope and financial results of these enormous monetary transactions (a more constant quantity than any other in the money market), by which the "tribute" of our Indian empire is brought into the aggregate income of the United Kingdom. This shall be done in the concisest form practicable—though even so at the risk of some repetition.

1. The Secretary of State for India is the largest and only *constant* seller of silver in the world—this position being somewhat modified whilst the Indian mints remain closed, the rupee being thereby made a token coin, though still legal tender in India.

2. Thus he can always affect, indeed control, the supply of the white metal at a price limited, upwards, only by the alternative of remitters to the East sending out bar silver. This margin is not a wide one; but it is also specialized by the fact that he alone has always silver ready to be delivered in India (see Mr. Goschen's Silver Committee Report, 1876, etc., etc.).

3. Here the Indian Secretary can each week fix the minimum *price* he will sell at; and he need not, as now, announce beforehand the *amount* he will sell —he can limit that at his own discretion as one means of setting the price of his own drafts or of silver.

4. But it is the interest of the City—primarily of the Anglo-Indian banks and East India merchants—to secure the India Office drafts at the lowest rate they can get them: thus their class interest (including that of the brokers) makes it possible for the buyers to maintain an understanding not to offer more than a certain minimum price each week.

5. For years past (with certain brief and ill-timed exceptions) it has seemed that the India Office weakly defers to the City interest, virtually placing itself at the mercy of that interest—thereby, in effect, selling its bills by "Dutch auction," that is, to the lowest bidders.

6. The consideration on which that class and market interest chiefly relies is the assumption that the Secretary of State *must* sell his bills; and in the long run that is so.

7. But there is this important difference in the position of the two parties: the buyers (bankers and merchants) must remit at the *precise dates* when their obligations fall due—apart from any margin for speculation at uncertain times, evidence of which motive is shown by the frequent instances of five, eight, or even ten times the amount offered by the India Office being applied for. But the Secretary of State is not so bound to special dates or even seasons; he is always backed by a considerable (often too large) cash balance at the Bank of England, which should enable him to exercise his own option and reserve both as to price and amount from one week, or even one month, to another—allowing, of course (as in para. 2), for trade price and supply of silver.

8. There is also the reserve resource of borrowing in sterling (several times resorted to in recent years): this at once saves for the time a large sum in "cost of exchange": (as to this course, its scope and permanent influence on Indian finance, see Part 1, Vol. XV., East India Association's *Journal*, 1883, etc., etc.).

As Sir Henry Fowler is now enjoying a position of less responsibility and greater freedom than at the time he briefly raised this large question in practical financial management, we venture, with deference, to offer him the above as a basis of material on which to work it out. For our part, we make little doubt that such a solution could be found as would result in a saving to India of many lakhs, if not a crore or two in the year. W. M. W.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL REFORM IN INDIA.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Recent events in India have revived a taunt that was levelled against the Indian National Congress in the earlier days of its existence—that its supporters devote their energies exclusively to political emancipation, that they are dead to the sentiments of justice and compassion which would prompt them to mitigate the hardships of women, and that they are indisposed to change or relax any of those customs and observances of private life which are detrimental to their own interests and happiness, and would not for a moment be tolerated by the least civilised nation in the West. It is now asserted that so long as the adherents of the Congress allowed the Social Conference the use of their pavilion, they had some ground for pleading that they ware not opposed to social reform; but that they have now thrown off the veil, and stand revealed in their true colours as uncompromising enemies of such reform.

If the rank and file of the Congress were really, as a body, opposed to social progress, that movement would undoubtedly be discredited, and would with good reason lose the sympathies, not only of a good many Englishmen, but also of many Indians who are

among its strongest supporters. The attitude taken up by the critics of the Congress in this sense is to all appearances logical enough. Say they to the political reformers: "You have deliberately abstained from discussing questions which affect the social or moral welfare of millions in India, and now, as you have declined to lend the use of your hall to those interested in such matters, you cannot with decency pretend that you are not opposed to them." Undoubtedly a deplorable state of affairs, if true. But is there any foundation for this charge?

I need hardly say that as a Christian, and as one who, in his several visits to England, has spent many years in that country, and has naturally imbibed many ideas which regulate social and family life in the West, I am strongly of opinion that there is as urgent a need of reform in social matters in India as there is in political matters. My sympathy is enlisted equally in support of the social reformer and of the political reformer. To my mind both are the direct outcome of British rule in India. Both have received the same education and training, both have been brought into contact with Western civilisation, and both are desirous of emancipating themselves from the thraldom to which they are subjected, in the one case by the strong grip of a foreign power, in the other case by the equally strong grasp of time-honoured rules and customs, regarded by some as part of the religious system of their country. The result of education has been to stimulate among its recipients a general desire for progress. Some have developed into active political reformers, others into social reformers, and others, again, are equally earnest and active in both causes. Yet whereas the the majority of political reformers in India, if not all of them, are from the force of circumstances social reformers as well, sometimes even though they be unconscious of the fact, and may even strenuously deny it, the social reformers may be absolutely wanting in any interest in political reforms. How an educated man can possibly say he is an opponent of social reform is to me incomprehensible. He is in his daily life unceasingly engaged in breaking down the barriers that hem him in on all sides, and prevent him, and those in whom he is interested, from extricating themselves from the influence of customs and practices that are now considered obnoxious or inconvenient or unnecessary. If he were to say, "I object to this or that particular reform being carried out," I would accept his statement; but not if he asserted that in his mode of living, in his relations with other men and with the members of his family, he was rigidly following the footsteps of his forefathers, and carrying out strictly the injunctions of his religion. Some there are in remote villages in the interior of the country, where English education and Western civilisation have not penetrated, who might truthfully assert this; but in the cities and towns the so-called orthodox Hindu is constantly committing breaches of law and custom which would have horrified his ancestors, and put him, not very long ago, beyond the pale of Hinduism. I do not allude to such acts and omissions on his part as have been rendered criminal by the existing law of the land, but to such acts and omissions as are entirely under his control, and in respect of which he need not allow himself to be influenced by extraneous opinion. A Brahman professor of law lectures on Hindu law to a class of students the majority of whom are Sudras, and a Brahman priest goes to the house of Sudras to expound the sacred scriptures. But what says Manu, the highest authority as to the interpretation of these scriptures?—

> "For he who tells him the law and he who enjoins upon him (religious) observances, he indeed, together with that (Sudra) sinks into the darkness of the hell called Asamurtta (unbounded)."

A Brahman pleader appears in court for a few rupees to defend a low-caste man on a charge of having assaulted one belonging to the twice-born castes, conveniently forgetting that:—

> "If a man of one birth assault one of the twice-born castes, even with virulent words, he ought to have his tongue cut out, for he is of the lowest origin."

Or perhaps he prosecutes a Brahman for stealing the goods of a Sudra, ignoring the text:—

> "Whatever exists in the universe is all the property of the Brahman. A Brahman may take possession of the goods of a Sudra with perfect peace of mind, for, since nothing at all belongs to this (Sudra) as his own, he is one whose property may be taken away by his master."

A man of high caste, if he is consistent, should not allow even the shadow of a *Malech* (outcast) to fall upon him. Yet he now travels complacently in a railway train rubbing shoulders with the lowest pariah, whose very touch is pollution. The really orthodox Hindu refuses to allow the well from which he draws water to be polluted by low castes. The political reformer rushes to the first pump and draws the water, or gets his servants to do it for him, utterly regardless of the fact that a moment before a *chamar* or a sweeper had done the same.

It is needless to multiply instances to prove how commonly so-called orthodox persons infringe caste rules and regulations to suit their own convenience. But the case may be carried further. Are there not many who quietly, yet deliberately, proceed to ignore the ordinances of their own religion to satisfy their appetites? Are there no Hindus in the full enjoyment of their caste privileges who systematically eat forbidden food and drink alcoholic drinks, and this often in the company of men whose touch should be pollution to them? It might be replied that there are some who do so, but that there are a great many others who do not—who strictly eschew anything that is forbidden. This is undoubtedly true; but, judged according to their own canons, they are not less guilty, for they eat, drink, and associate with fellow-caste people, or members of their own family who have committed serious infractions of caste rules, and who would undoubtedly have been put out of caste a few years ago. Can the political reformer deny that, according to the opinion generally prevailing amongst Hindus in India, for a man to cross the ocean (the "black water") is a sin which entails the penalty of being outcasted? Yet, at the sixth meeting of the National Congress, held at Calcutta, delegate after delegate, all belonging to the orthodox community, came forward, each on behalf of his province, and supported the motion for holding a Congress in London in the year 1892. And how is it that within recent years young men

who have visited England do not have meted out to them the penalty of being outcasted by some of the Hindu communities, though but a short time back they would not have received this consideration? It is not that they are re-admitted into caste, which would imply that they had had to undergo the humiliating ceremony of doing *praschit* (penance), but they are treated as if they had never lost caste, and are allowed all the privileges of the community to which they belong. Many more would undoubtedly receive this consideration, but that they become somewhat Anglicised in their habits, and are not disposed, even for the sake of keeping up appearances, to conform to the social customs of the family. Again, many associations have come into existence, each composed of the members of its own caste, and having for its object the correction of abuses which have crept into their community. Thus we have the Kayastha Conference, the Vaeshya Conference, and the Vaisnava Conference, besides minor societies which are more local in their operations. The members of these conferences and societies are undoubtedly recruited chiefly from the educated classes. Among the subjects they take up for discussion may be found female education, the raising of the minimum age of marriage, reduction of unnecessary expenditure at marriages and funerals, total abstinence, the discouragement of the employment of women of questionable character to sing on festive occasions, and generally the introduction and promotion of such measures as would tend to elevate the community.

It would, therefore, be idle on the part of any educated Indian to assert that he is opposed to social reform. His own daily life would contradict him. He may in some cases say that he is helpless—that unless he allowed himself to drift with the tide, he would be wrecked; but that if he had his own way, he would not have sanctioned any departure from the customs of his forefathers. A little consideration will convince him that it is absurd for him to assume a virtuous air and condemn his associates if they try to correct abuses and introduce reforms from which he himself profits. The number of such men is but few. But a few can sometimes do much mischief. The social customs of the Hindus are intimately connected with their religion. Any attempt to change them is only too readily construed into an attack upon their religion. Thus, at Poona, it was a few irreconcilables who, alleging that the social reformers had serious designs against the religious institutions of the Hindus, obtained the support of a goodly number of the less educated members of their community, and vehemently protested against the Congress allowing the use of its pavilion to the Social Conference. But was the main body of the National Congress in sympathy with them? Decidedly not. Mr. Justice Ranade addressed a circular letter to the various Standing Congress Committees asking their opinion on the question of the loan of the Congress pandal to the Conference, and, as he stated in his inaugural address:—

> "There were 28 replies favourable to the Conference, *plus* 4 which are indifferent, or advise reference to the Congress—in all 32. There are besides 17 unfavourable, but of that number 10 are in full sympathy with Conference work, but advise concession this year to the Poona opposition, and there are only 7 replies which seem to be opposed. The proportion of favourable to unfavourable is thus nearly 2 to 1, and including those who advise concession for this year only, the proportion is as 6 to 1."

It is evident therefore that if the matter had been referred to the body of delegates assembled at the last Congress, their decision would have been in favour of the social reformers. Mr. Justice Ranade, however, removed all possible difficulty by abstaining from asking for the use of the hall. To an outside observer it seems clear that the Social Conference has gained considerably by this incident. It has succeeded in advertising itself more than it could possibly have done if it had pursued its usual course. That it is making its power and influence felt may be presumed from the fact that it has at last been thought desirable in some quarters to adopt an attitude of active hostility towards it. In future it will have to be reckoned with as a factor which cannot be ignored. The National Congress cannot possibly suffer from an incident which was purely local in its inception and operation. The main body of delegates are not and cannot be opposed to social reform and there is no reason to suppose that in Calcutta and elsewhere the social reformers will not receive the welcome hitherto accorded to them. The *Hindu*, the most orthodox journal of that community, has very clearly expressed this view. It says:—

> "The Social Conference is as much under the guidance of educated Hindus as the political Congress, and in fact a large number of men are directly associated with both. How then the Congress or the educated Indians as a class can be said to be opposed to social reform we do not understand. We may regret the illiberal and unpatriotic attitude of individuals, but that cannot be mistaken for the attitude of the whole community."

Stronger testimony than this could not possibly be obtained. It is time therefore that the critics of the Congress refrained from directing their shafts against it on the ground that it has deliberately decided to exclude from its own meetings discussion upon social questions. The reasons which led it to take this course were admirably expressed by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in his Presidential address at the second Congress:—

> "How," he asked, "can this gathering of all classes discuss the social reforms needed in each individual class? What do any of us know of the internal home life, of the traditions, customs, feelings, prejudices, of any class but his own? How could a cosmopolitan gathering like this discuss to any purpose the reforms needed in any one class? Only the members of that class can effectively deal with the reforms therein needed. A National Congress must confine itself to questions in which the entire nation has a direct participation, and it must leave the adjustment of social reforms and other class questions to class congresses. But it does not follow because this national political body, as such, does not presume to discuss social reforms that the delegates here present are not just as deeply—nay, in many cases, far more deeply—interested in those questions than in those political questions which we *do* discuss, or that those several communities which these delegates represent are not doing their utmost to solve those complicated problems on which hinges the practical introduction of those reforms. Any man who has eyes and ears open must know what struggles towards higher and better things are going on in every community. And it could not be otherwise with the noble education we are receiving. Once you begin to think about your own actions, your duties and responsibilities to yourself, your neighbour, and your nation, you cannot avoid

looking round and discerning much that is wrong amongst you. And we know as a fact that each community is now doing its best according to its lights, and the progress that it has made in education. The Muhammadans know how much is being done by persons of their community to push on the education their brethren so much need; the Hindus are everywhere doing what they can to reform those social institutions which they think require improvement. There is not a single community here represented of which the best and ablest men do not feel that much has to be done to improve the social, moral, and religious status of their brethren, and in which, as a fact, they are not striving to effect gradually those needful improvements; but these are essentially matters too delicate for a stranger's handling—matters which must be left to the guidance of those who alone fully understand them in all their bearings, and which are wholly unsuited to discussion in an assemblage like this, in which men of all classes, creeds, and castes are intermingled."

Correspondence.

THE CONGRESS AND THE ANGLO-INDIAN PRESS.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—The Eleventh Congress, as evidence of the vitality and growing popularity of the movement, leaves little to be desired. If it has been as productive of hostile criticism it has also been as great a success as any of its predecessors—a fact little relished, if fully realised, by the Anglo-Indian press. The criticism emanating from that reputable quarter might, perhaps, be properly appreciated if it were less captious and more constructive. In relation to the Congress it is somewhat difficult to determine what is the precise mission of the Anglo-Indian journalist. If it be "to inform, to instruct, to amuse," then, if a failure in the first and second parts of the programme, he is often a success in the third, for the scribe of the Anglo-Indian newspaper is frequently, and without knowing it, a born humourist. This fact is never more apparent than when he is "set on" to beat the Congress dog. It is a noticeable fact that, in honour of the Congress, all the Anglo-Indian organs play the same tune, with variations. The *Englishman* starts the new year on old lines, peculiarly its own, and its brief but bitter article on "The Opening of the Congress" is in that journal's best form—lack of logic with an abundance of abuse being its characteristic features. When it is dealing with any popular or progressive movement one hardly looks for an exhibition of good taste or fair play from Calcutta's champion of cliques and *coteries*. But one is hardly prepared for that ancient expedient of quoting from "a letter addressed to us." This is the latest *ruse* of the *Englishman*. Commenting upon the closing sentences of the President's address, this refined and sensitive critic says: "It pains us to descend from these lofty heights to a lower, but more practical level." "Very different sentiments," it continues, "were expressed in a letter addressed to us by another Congress enthusiast, who writes with a vigour and feeling all his own." After which peroration the *Englishman* treats us to the following: "The time shall come when we will kick out of India the whole set of you pale-faced braggarts, and rule our country in the name of our good Empress." Who was the author of this letter? It smacks somewhat of the written-to-order-impromptus which not unfrequently grace the "correspondence" column of anti-Congress journals, and which sceptical readers place in the same category with the letters signed "Conservative Working-Man" or "Son of the Soil" in Tory newspapers at election times. The views expressed in these letters have a strange resemblance to those of the newspapers in which they appear. We will assume the *Englishman* to be above that sort of thing; and perhaps, until the identity of that "Congress enthusiast" is revealed, it were premature to ask whether the feelings expressed were "all his own." Was the letter anonymous, or did it bear an authentic signature—"not necessarily for publication but as a gurantee of good faith"? These are questions which the *Englishman* alone can answer. There is always something new to be learned from its columns. For instance, the statement that "the Congress stands revealed as a body which has nothing to do with popular wants and grievances" will come as a revelation to many. However, as proof that the *Englishman* dares to be a Daniel, it refers to the President's address as an "extremely able" one. Less from the *Englishman* one might expect—more one dare not hope for.

It is more a matter for regret than anger that our persistent, if inconsistent, critic, the *Pioneer*, should discover "marvellous inconsistencies" in some of the Congress speeches. This charge, coming from such a quarter, is an unfortunate one. Even if a fellow-feeling fails to make our critics "wondrous kind," we might reasonably look for silent sympathy from those sharing a fellow-failing. Yet the clouds that obscure the "views" of Anglo-Indian scribes are not without promise of a clearer horizon. Where the force of good example is not only felt, but acknowledged, there is hope; and the frank self-criticisms, or "heart-searchings," of earnest Congress speakers have already borne good fruit. First among our critics to take the hint and to testify to the value of wholesome introspection is the *Pioneer* itself. Open confession is good for the soul, and a New Year's retrospective "leader" an excellent medium for easing a newspaper's conscience. There is a promise of better things in the admission that "papers, like individuals, cannot look back over the past without seeing an abundance of mistakes to regret and faults to deplore, errors of taste and judgment, lapses from fairness sometimes, and prejudice." In so becoming a manner does the *Pioneer* celebrate its anniversary, and this stray leaf from its "confession book" makes by no means an ill-chosen birthday card. It is to be hoped that its sentiments may become those of the whole Anglo-Indian Press. Nothing could be more welcome than a universal awakening of its long-dormant conscience.

One prominent feature of the hostile criticisms on the Eleventh Congress was the ill-disguised hope of a "split" in the Congress camp. The gentlemen of the Anglo-Indian Press were evidently, like a certain pugnacious Hibernian, "living in hopes of a row." Their hopes, if high, were short-lived. That anything approaching a serious rupture would not have been hailed with acclamation by the reporters and "special correspondents" of certain "patriotic" journals, it would be hard indeed to believe. Seldom were prophets of impending disaster more confident. Of their prophecies would it be uncharitable to say that the wish was father to the thought? But the false prophets, if foolish before, have not shown themselves wise after the event. Their disappointment is no doubt too great to admit of disguise, though some amongst them try to conceal their chagrin at the non-fulfilment of their predictions of a "scene." They unconsciously deplore the absence of dissension by bitterly attacking the men and methods through whom and by which a peaceful solution of unforeseen difficulties was arrived at.

The *Times of India*, in pleading the cause of social reform, conveniently ignores the fact that the National Congress also holds a brief on the same side and in the same case. The *Times* attempts to draw the proverbial red herring across the path of political progress. Two brief extracts from the same article will suffice to indicate its policy and the strange fears that influence it. "In dealing elsewhere with the Congress as an agency hostile or indifferent to social reform, we have," it says, "exhibited one of its chief defects as an educator of public opinion"; after which the Congress is described as having for one of its chief aims "the removal of the Englishman [or does it mean the *Englishman?*] from his present place of influence in the Administration."

It is a truism that any stick is good enough to beat the Congress; but, on this occasion, the available sticks must have been few in number, for the same cudgel appears to have been passed from hand to hand, and to have done yeoman service. The *Bombay Gazette* comes forward as yet another disinterested champion of Social Reform. It tells us that "the Congress has been persuaded by the reactionaries of Poona to spurn the Social Conference from its doors." The picture of the Social Conference being driven from home by its co-worker is a truly pathetic one, whilst it does infinite credit to the tender sympathies and powerful imagination of the *Bombay Gazette*.

Perhaps the Twelfth Congress will find some improvement in the methods and the manners of its critics.—Yours, etc.,

London, February 10th. Criticus.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MARCH, 1896.

THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

The second Session of the fourteenth Parliament of Queen Victoria was opened on February 11th. The Queen's Speech, which was not quite so long as a sermon, set forth, in addition to no fewer than thirteen distinct proposals for domestic legislation, a remarkable and alarming catalogue of foreign difficulties. Shortly after the present Government took office, Mr. G. N. Curzon, M.P., who seems to combine the grace of the courtier with the dignity of the pedagogue, assured the British public that already in many parts of the world they had evidence of the salutary change. Matters which, under the wicked Liberals, had dragged along, now found a speedy solution. Crises which had impended in Lord Rosebery's time disappeared as if by magic at Lord Salisbury's — and Mr. Curzon's — approach. The irresistible conclusion was, Mr. Curzon added, that a different impression had been formed abroad of the calibre of the new Government. If Mr. Curzon is capable of regret, he must be sorry he spoke. He and his colleagues are now confronted with such an accumulation of foreign trouble as has never within recent times claimed the attention of Parliament. It is the same story whether we look to America, to Asia, or to Africa. If Mr. Curzon's test were just, as it is not, foreign opinion of the calibre of the present Government must be uncomplimentary indeed. The course of subsequent events ought to have reminded Mr. Curzon and his friends that he who putteth on his armour should not boast himself as he that putteth it off. Mr. Balfour, that we may do him justice, stood in no need of the warning. He had not been many weeks in office when he volunteered the prediction that the difficulties of the Government would arise not in domestic affairs but in international relations. Difficulties may yet arise in both quarters. It has, indeed, happened more than once that, under a Conservative Government, attention has been diverted from needs and expectations at home by excursions and alarms abroad. This piece of history may, of course, repeat itself. But the present Government, which has the largest majority, has also the longest programme of modern times. Its followers are essentially sectional, and if they are to shout together they will have to be humoured separately. Will the ardent Churchman be satisfied by the relief of rural rates? Will the distressed landlord begin to prosper when "voluntary" schools receive further subsidies from public funds? Will the able-bodied man in search of employment—the denizen of Lord Salisbury's "black stream of distrust"—be content if the Transvaal question is amicably determined? Will the industrial veteran in search of a pension consent to be put off with a reference to Armenia? The answers to questions like these are the measure of the Government's difficulties. Abroad its hands are full. At home it depends upon the favour of many heterogeneous sections whose expectations, if they are to be satisfied, will need the undivided energy of the Government. There are, after all, some feats which are beyond even a majority of 150.

If there was one charge which, above all others, the Conservative Opposition was never tired of bringing against the late Liberal Government, it was the charge of "log-rolling." Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, and afterwards Lord Rosebery and his colleagues, were accused of parading an enormous programme, which was designed, not to become law, but to keep together the discordant "items" of their party. Accordingly, while in the House of Lords the theory was urged that no Bill might become law which had not been singly approved by a united electorate, in the House of Commons the maxim was enforced that one Session must produce no more than one measure. Viewed in the light of these doctrines, the legislative proposals of the Government are, like Sam Weller's knowledge of London, extensive and peculiar. Here is the little list of subjects in tabular form:—

1. The "extension and improvement of the naval "defences of the Empire" —"the most important "subject."
2. Measures to mitigate agricultural distress.
3. Further assistance of "voluntary" schools.
4. Compensation of workmen for injuries.
5. Amendment of the Irish Land Acts.
6. Amendment of the law relating to public health in Scotland.
7. The avoidance and settlement of trade disputes.
8. Facilities for the construction of light railways in the United Kingdom.
9. The regulation of public companies.
10. Restrictions upon the "importation" (*sic*) of destitute aliens.
11. Amendment of the law relating to the London water supply.
12. Institution of a Board of Agriculture in Ireland.
13. Amendment of the law of evidence.

"Thirteen all"—not a lucky number, but a large order for a single Session. It is plain, however, that the Government does not regard the various measures as equally important. The first is officially described as most important. The next five receive each a separate paragraph in the Queen's Speech. The last seven are disposed of together in an "omnibus" paragraph at the end. Perhaps it may be assumed, therefore, that (say) the first few weeks of the Session will be taken up with the first half-dozen measures. We may also note that, although this catalogue of measures is tolerably long, it is not so long as the catalogue of promises which were offered to the electors by Conservative candidates at the General Election. Mr. Balfour is commonly regarded as one of the most sceptical and least effusive members of his party. But the electioneering "literature" which was displayed in his constituency last summer promised the following boons which are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne:—(i) the "referendum"; (ii) classification of paupers; (iii) improvements in the dwellings of the poor; (iv) extension of small holdings; (v) centralisation of poor-law and school board rates; (vi) church defence (or is this the same as number 3 above?); (vii) registration reform; (viii) redistribution of seats; (ix) facilities to enable working men to purchase their houses; (x) fair wages for Government workmen; (xi) local government for Ireland; and last, but not least, (xii) old-age pensions.

"I have urged you," said Mr. Chamberlain at Leeds in September, 1894, "I have urged you as "representatives of a united party to see that it is "your duty first to formulate, then sincerely to "undertake and to promote, a living policy of "domestic and social reform; and I do not hesitate "to say that the Unionist party is, in my judgment, "peculiarly fitted both by its traditions and by its "composition to undertake this great constructive "work." In the following month, at Birmingham, Mr. Chamberlain produced his programme. It consisted chiefly of three proposals:—old age pensions, improvement of working-class dwellings, and the grant of State loans to enable working men to become the proprietors of their houses. The programme was unauthorised, it fell as flat as a pancake, and Mr. Chamberlain's proposals find no place in the Queen's Speech. The omission can hardly be gratifying to Mr. Chamberlain, but amid the incense of praise which has been offered up in his honour during the past few weeks he is doubtless prepared to overlook minor slights. The debate on the address was concerned chiefly with foreign affairs, which, as was to be expected, have absorbed public attention in the United Kingdom since the beginning of this storm-laden new year. The Queen's Speech contained three references to India, touching the Pamirs, the Siam Agreement, and Chitral respectively. These topics we discuss elsewhere. On the last-named Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., as Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, submitted a suitable amendment, and was able to muster the respectable total of 79 in the division lobby. The Government does not appear to have weighed the imprudence of encouraging discontent in India at a time when it is faced with grave difficulties and anxieties in all quarters of the globe. Lord Salisbury's failure in Armenia, following his brave words at the Guildhall, has produced a deep and widespread feeling of humiliation, and, although Mr. Chamberlain acted promptly and firmly in dealing with Dr. Jameson's raid, his conduct of the affair has not been free from mistakes, and we are not yet out of the wood. The Venezuela question has been the subject of interesting and academic speeches which add little that is new to the discussion, though they testify to the now general desire for arbitration. The moral that educated India will inevitably draw from all these transactions is not one which patriotic Englishmen can regard with much satisfaction. In Ashanti we have had recourse to a needless expedition for the purpose, and with the effect, of bringing the weak to their knees. In the Transvaal, while Dr. Jameson's raid has been condemned, it has been shown that violence is sometimes a remarkably potent method of agitation. In Venezuela and in Armenia, where the possibilities of opposition are more formidable, we seem in the one case to have modified our demands, while, in the other case, we have utterly and ignominiously failed. But in Chitral, in dealing with native tribes and unrepresented taxpayers, we congratulate ourselves upon having violated, in the name of "prestige," the express and explicit pledges of our own proclamation.

THE CHITRAL AMENDMENT.

THE NESCIENCE OF LORD G. HAMILTON.

We refer in "Indiana" to the debate in the House of Commons on the Chitral amendment on February 17th, of which a full report will be found in our Parliamentary Supplement.

Lord George Hamilton deprecated, in vehement and occasionally abusive language, the allegation that the retention of Chitral involved a breach of faith, and asked, rhetorically, if Sir W. Wedderburn was acquainted with the facts of the case.

Lord George Hamilton's amazing speech suggests —not rhetorically—the same question with reference to himself.

The Viceroy's proclamation, he said, "merely applied to the territory between Peshawar and Chitral, and it had absolutely nothing to do with the people of Chitral."

The proclamation is given in full at page 39 of the Blue-book (C.—7,864), "Correspondence relating to Chitral." It contains these two explicit undertakings:—

(i) "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and prevent any future, unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained, the force will be withdrawn."

(ii) "The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes."

Each of these two promises was supplementary of the other. The first promised withdrawal from Chitral; the second promised that no intervening territory should be occupied. Taken together, these

promises amounted to a complete pledge against occupation, and the question to whom they were addressed is a question of purely academic interest.

That the proclamation was intended to convey this meaning is conclusively shown by the Chitral Blue-book.

The date of the proclamation (which was not merely issued to the people of Swat and Bajaur, but was also "generally communicated upon the border") was March 14th, 1895. On March 8th Lord Elgin had telegraphed to Sir H. Fowler that certain measures were necessary to "ensure" the "safety" of Dr. Robertson, and on the same day Sir H. Fowler had replied:—

"I am prepared to approve such action for securing safety of Robertson and party as you may deem necessary."

The proclamation was issued after the receipt of this reply, and it expressly stated that the purpose of the relief expedition was to compel Umra Khan to retire from Chitral.

Note Sir Henry Fowler's words: "action for securing safety of Robertson and party." On March 18th Lord Elgin telegraphed that orders had been issued for the mobilization of the first division of the field army. At once—on the same day—Sir H. Fowler telegraphed to Lord Elgin:—

"Please let me know why so large a force is considered necessary for securing safety of Robertson and party."

Again we have the phrase "securing safety of Robertson and party." There was not even a hint at that time—the time at which the proclamation was issued—of retention or occupation. Moreover, when the Government of India afterwards suggested the idea, Sir Henry Fowler replied (June 13th, 1895. Blue-book p. 51):—

"Her Majesty's Government. . . . have decided that no military force or European agent shall be kept at Chitral, that Chitral shall be fortified, and that no road shall be made between Peshawar and Chitral. It will follow that all positions beyond our frontier, now held in consequence of the recent relief operations, should be evacuated as speedily as circumstances allow."

This was manifestly Sir H. Fowler's policy and intention from the outset. The expedition was a relief expedition, pure and simple. When Lord George Hamilton succeeded Sir H. Fowler he permitted the Government of India to reverse this policy and to occupy Chitral, and he now vainly seeks to justify a glaring breach of faith on the ground that Chitral is "a much richer country than was anticipated." It would be an odd thing if a man charged with burglary sought to defend himself on the ground that his booty proved more valuable than he had anticipated.

Lord George Hamilton's assertion that the people of Chitral "welcome the English occupation" is open to two criticisms. The first is that, even if it were founded on fact, it would still be irrelevant. The second is that we have heard the same sort of thing before. In fact Lord George Hamilton was answered in advance by Sir Auckland Colvin. In the *Nineteenth Century* for November last Sir Auckland Colvin wrote:—

"For the moment, all is painted *couleur de rose*. The Swat tribesmen, if Simla telegrams may be trusted, are not content merely to condone our occupation of such points in their territory as Chakdara and the Malakand Pass. They insist in demanding that the Government of India should administer their country. They would even be mortified at the refusal of their request. If this is so, nothing could be happier. . . . . Still, it is well to recall to mind that something very like it has been heard on previous and analogous occasions. Events which belied the accuracy of precisely similar assertions in 1838 are now so distant that their echo has become well-nigh inaudible. But some may remember, and those who have forgotten may be reminded, that in 1838 there were not wanting voices which loudly proclaimed the delight of the Afghan nation at their deliverance from their elected ruler. Four years later, when Afghanistan had unmistakably spoken for itself, those voices were conspicuously silent. It came at length to be recognised that among the Afghans were many who, from complaisance, from compulsion, or from cunning, had protested too much; and whose too effusive expressions of welcome had misled many who were in haste to credit them. With that experience in our minds, it will be as well to suspend judgment as to the credence to be placed in the reports which reach us of the pleasure of the tribesmen at the permanent settlement of British troops within their borders. All that as yet can be seen clearly is that there has been made by the Government of India a fresh departure, which may lead to grave complications, either in the immediate or in a more distant future."

As for the cost of this "forward" move, Lord G. Hamilton said in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn that "he thought the expenditure would be less than was anticipated, and, so far from Indian finance being in a critical condition, they must bear in mind that there had been a considerable remission of taxation by the reduction in the cotton duties." In the same strain of ludicrous optimism Lord George, at the close of his speech, "congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned." Against Lord George Hamilton's congratulations and beliefs we may well set the reasoned conclusions of an ex-Finance Minister like Sir Auckland Colvin. In the article in the *Nineteenth Century* from which we have already quoted, Sir A. Colvin wrote:—

"The situation. . . . is surrounded by clouds and darkness. Is it a time to prophesy smooth things, to smile complacently, to exchange congratulations, to talk comfortably about the clouds going by? It seems, indeed, difficult to understand how it can be believed that the financial outlook, as was said in the recent Indian budget debates, is better than it was three years ago. Three years ago the necessity of re-imposing the cotton duties had not been demonstrated. The Famine Grant had not been appropriated to current revenues. Three years ago the Secretary of State sold his bills at 1s. $2\frac{9}{16}$d.; at present he barely touches 1s. $1\frac{3}{4}$d. The deficit three years ago was Rx. 800,000; now it is estimated at well over a million. For, three years ago, the forward frontier policy had been but recently revived, and we had not made the progress in creating and completing our new dominion and protectorate beyond the Indus which has been achieved of late. Frontier policy and Indian finance are as inseparable as foreign policy and finance in Western countries. There can be no improvement in Indian finance so long as Indian revenues are depleted by the claims of frontier extension, or exposed to the risk and requirements of war. Consequently there can be no vigorous internal policy, whether of railway development or of other kind. The most experienced are the first to recognise this. 'We know,' it was said in the course of the Chitral debate, 'that at the India Office, and among retired officers, the old-fashioned view prevails. But in India, and it is there where most responsibility rests, opinion is almost invariably opposed to it.' This reminds us of that other *dictum*, in its time also accepted, that 'the opinion of Colley on the frontier question was worth that of twenty Lawrences.' The 'old-fashioned' view has

been indicated in the course of this paper, and in the words of its first and greatest exponent. It is the old-fashioned view to 'protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling, as it is, to bear such pressure even for measures which they can both understand and appreciate.' It is the old-fashioned view to 'look for our true policy, our strongest' security in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses, in husbanding the finances of India, and in consolidating and multiplying its resources.' If in India, where most responsibility lies, these views are no longer in favour, let us learn why they have been discarded, and what are the views by which they have been replaced. If, on the other hand, their importance is still admitted, let us be told how they are to be made consistent with the present forward policy. Economy, the contentment of our Indian fellow-subjects, and multiplying the resources of British India may be merely the old-fashioned views of the India Office, of retired officers, of dead Viceroys, and of other unconsidered obscurities. But they are, at least, the views which in building up India in the past guided the great men who were charged with the task, and which enabled them to hand over the India of the present day, such as we still see it, to the men who are now responsible. Old-fashioned as they are, they are, therefore, views which will continue to challenge and command consideration till they have been proved unsuited to the India of the future."

These weighty words of Sir Auckland Colvin's, with their contempt of complacent smiles and congratulations, were, it seems, prophetic.

RAILWAYS IN INDIA.

A HEAVY FINANCIAL LOSS.

The "Administration Report on the Railways in India for 1894-95," by Lieutenant-Colonel T. Gracey, R.E., Officiating Director-General of Railways, has just been issued as a Blue-book (C.—7845).

In order to correct the optimism of this report it may be well to bear the following facts in mind.

The following figures show the true financial results to the Government of India, on Imperial account, of the Indian railways in 1884-5 and 1894-5:—[N.B. Rx.90,100 for Exchange Compensation is included in the charges for working expenses in 1894-5.]

INDIAN RAILWAYS (Imperial Account).

	1884-5. Rx.	1894-5. Rx.	Increase. Rx.
Net Traffic Receipts ..	Rx.7,400,192	11,672,600	4,272,408
Charges for Interest, etc.:			
In India	Rx.2,366,258	4,027,700	1,661,442
In England ..	£4,826,816	5,738,700	911,884
Exchange	Rx.1,172,877	4,782,200	3,609,323
Total Charges ..	Rx.8,365,951	14,548,600	6,182,649
Net Loss	Rx.965,759	2,876,000	1,910,241

If from the net loss in each year be deducted the charge for Exchange properly due to the fall in Exchange on the basis of the sterling expenditure in 1884-5, the result is as follows:—[N.B. Of the Rx.4,782,200 charged to Exchange in 1894-5, Rx.759,903 was due to increased sterling charges, and not primarily due to the fall in Exchange.]

	1884-5. Rx.	1894-5. Rx.	Increase. Rx.
Actual loss	965,759	2,876,000	1,910,241
Exchange	1,172,877	4,022,297	2,849,420
Profit (Exchange excluded)	Rx.207,118	Rx.1,146,297	Rx.939,179

From the foregoing figures it will be seen that the improvement of the Railway Revenue Account in India is no index of the actual results of the railway enterprise of the Government of India. In 1894-5 the railways cost the Government Rx.2,876,000 net, or Rx.1,910,241 more than in 1884-5, and this is the serious fact which must be kept in mind in considering the railway policy of the Government of India. It does not seem sound finance to borrow in gold for enterprises, however intrinsically desirable, which will probably, owing to the state of the Exchange, result in heavy loss in the future.

The Government of India is practically the owner of all the Indian railways, which have been built at a heavy cost and are maintained at a heavy annual expense. Of course, the Indian railway system is capable of almost infinite development, hardly more than the main trunk lines being yet in existence, and it is, therefore, of importance that that development should proceed upon lines of sound finance. The Government of India have recently been carrying out this development by methods which do not appear to be sound. When a feeder line has to be built, the present practice is to make over the project to a company, the company raising the capital and the Government building the line, and either working the completed undertaking or arranging that it shall be worked by an existing company. After a certain number of years the Government will inevitably buy out the company at what is certain to be an unnecessarily high figure.

This system seems to combine four distinct disadvantages:

(1) The capital in the first instance is raised on less favourable terms than the Government could command;

(2) A large amount of money is wasted in promotion money, commission, and other preliminary expenses of company-floating;

(3) A whole separate staff and establishment, with directorate, etc., is brought into existence, at unnecessary expense for a line which is dependent for its existence upon the trunk railway, and which could be, and is, most effectively and economically worked with the original undertaking; and

(4) A small and separate railway, with separate interests, is planted in the middle of a great system of State Railways, and must ultimately be bought out on terms less favourable to the State than those on which it could originally have been built.

It would be well if the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure would call for documents showing the latest terms upon which the Government of India is prepared to promote the construction of railways by companies. A statement should be asked for showing the financial results of every railway since construction, the terms upon which each was constructed, and the future rights and responsibilities of the Government with regard to them.

The Government of India some years ago became entitled to purchase the Great Indian Peninsular, the Bombay and Baroda and other guaranteed railways, but waived their right for a period of years in return for certain modifications of the contracts. A statement should be called for showing approximately, for each railway:

(1) What is the present yearly loss to the revenues of India on account of this waiver by the Government;

(2) What is the present yearly gain to the revenues of India on account of the modifications of the contracts; and

3) What was the price at which the Government might have purchased these railways in 1875, and what is the probable price which the Government will have to pay on the next date on which it can exercise the option of purchase, and when.

With regard to the Bengal Central Railway, it is desirable to know why a guarantee was given to this company and upon what terms, and what the yearly loss has been. In the Finance Accounts of the Government of India there is a constantly recurring footnote with reference to this railway, to the effect that "although for convenience classified among State Railways, this line is the property of the Bengal Central Railway Company."

The following extract from an article in the *Economist* for July 27th, 1895, upon the Administration Report of Indian Railways, 1894-5, gives a very clear and authoritative statement of the nature of one portion of the present contracts between the Government of India and the Guaranteed Railway Companies:—

"The result of the working of the Great Indian Peninsular Railway, which is clearly brought out in the Report, shows that during the first half of 1894 the net earnings amounted to Rx. 1,265,800, while during the second half of the year the net earnings only amounted to Rx. 358,700, or a total for the year of Rx. 1,624,500. Now, as we have already explained, in order to arrive at the surplus profits, which have to be declared each half-year separately, the guaranteed interest in sterling has to be converted into rupees at the nominal rate of 1s. 10d., and not at their true value, and in the cash of this railway the sum to be thus set aside amounts half-yearly to Rx. 657,700. Upon this basis of calculation the surplus profits during the first half of the year amounted to Rx. 608,100, of which the company's half-share was Rx. 304,000. During the second half of the year there were no surplus profits. The net receipts, in fact, fell far short of the amount required to meet the guaranteed interest, and owing to the arrangement by which the profits are declared on a half-yearly instead of a yearly basis, the surplus profits at the end of the first half-year do not form a set-off against the loss during the second half, and the Government had, therefore, to make good the loss, partly out of its own share of surplus profits, and partly from the general revenues of the country.

"The net result on the year's working was therefore, this: The Company obtained Rx. 304,000 of so-called surplus profits, which enabled them to pay their shareholders an extra dividend of 16s. 4d. over and above the guaranteed interest of 5 per cent. The Government, on the other hand, had to pay the guaranteed interest, which at the average rate for the official year amounted to no less a sum than Rx. 2,207,800. To meet this, they had the net receipts for the whole year, less the company's sehre of surplus profits, viz., (Rx. 1,624,300—Rx. 304,000), Rx. 1,320,300, and they therefore had to provide Rx. 887,500 to make good the guaranteed interest. In other words, while the company were able to distribute an extra dividend of 16s. 4d., the State suffered a loss of Rx. 887.500. Had, on the other hand, the terms of the contract simply provided a 5 per cent. sterling guarantee with a half share of any surplus profits at the end of the year after meeting the guaranteed interest out of the earnings of the undertaking, the company would have had no suplus profits with which to declare an extra dividend, and as the whole of the net earnings would have gone towards meeting the guaranteed interest, the loss of the State would have been reduced to (Rx. 2,207,800 — Rx. 1,624,300) Rx. 583,500, a loss solely due to the fall in the value of the rupee and therefore pratically unavoidable.

"It is evident, therefore, that the loss which the Indian Government has had to bear in connection with the three older guaranteed companies still in existence, and which during the past year alone amounted to over Rx. 1,500,000, has not, as is usually asserted, been solely due to the depreciation of the rupee, but must to a considerable extent be attributed to the very faulty nature of the contracts with the companies. It must also be remembered that not only do these contracts enable the companies to declare higher dividends than their properties really earn, but they also naturally enhance the price of the company's stock in the money market, and as, when the Indian Government wishes to exercise their option of purchase, they have to do so at a valuation based on the average market value of the stock for three years previous to the date of purchase, it follows that they will be compelled to purchase at an inflated capital value."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Arthur Charles Trevor, C.S.I., of the Indian Civil Service, to be a member of the Council of the Governor General of India, in succession to Sir Charles Pritchard, K.C.S.I., who is compelled to resign for reasons of health. Mr. Trevor is at present a member of the Council of the Governor of Bombay.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. John Nugent, of the Bombay Civil Service, as a member of the Council of the Governor of Bombay, in the room of Mr. A. C. Trevor, C.S.I., who has been appointed to the Governor-General's Council.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Ralph Sillery Benson as a judge of the High Court of Judicature in Madras. "Mr. Benson's appointment will," the official announcement ran, "fill the vacancy in the Court caused in 1887 by the retirement of Mr. Brandt. Mr. Benson has been a member of the Indian Civil Service since 1873. He was the officer who carried through the settlement of lands in the Nilgiri districts, and has had a varied judicial experience in India."

Sir W. Wedderburn has given notice, for February 27th, of the following question in the House of Commons:—

"To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the Select Committee of the Madras Legislative Council in reporting on the Bill which afterwards became Act II of 1894 (Madras Proprietary Village Service Act) stated that they had no information regarding the duties of village servants, other than the village accountant:

"Whether the Act has been brought into force; and, if not, why not:

"And, whether, according to Mr. J. D. Rees, head-assistant collector at Tinnevelley, and other authorities, interference with the ancient village police system has led to an increase of crime."

In Sir Charles Aitchison, who died at Oxford on February 18th, the Empire has, as the *Times* truly said, lost one of the most distinguished of its Indian administrators. "In the history of the growth and the consolidation of our Indian Empire his name must ever be associated with that of Lord Lawrence all through the eventful period from 1856 to 1889." Writing a few months ago to a private correspondent Sir Charles Aitchison said:

"I am an adherent of the Lawrence, or non-aggressive, school—not the grotesque thing which it is the fashion to ridicule in the daily Press. Lord Lawrence's policy was no selfish policy of isolation. His desire was to fulfil all offices of good neighbourhood, to encourage peaceful intercourse with the tribes beyond our frontier, to develop trade with them, to induce them to settle down to the cultivation of their lands, to help them in our markets, dispensaries, and schools, and, when practicable, to arbitrate in their disputes. But he wished them to be left to manage their own affairs, and to choose their own

rulers, which he believed they could do better than we could do or them. Above all things, he had a horror of setting up our nominees as rulers, to be supported by English bayonets. His policy never had a fair chance; it was always disturbed by violent forward aggressions. As regards Chitral, we ought never to have gone there at all."

As will be seen from our Parliamentary Report Lord G. Hamilton stated on February 13th that he would be glad to lay the Durand Treaty on the Table, that, so far as he knew, no question of the extirpation or enslavement of the Kafir race had arisen, and that certainly no such contingency was contemplated when the Durand Treaty was agreed to. On February 20th Lord G. Hamilton added that the Government of India had "desired that telegraphic reports be sent to them from Chitral of any further operations." On February 18th a conference, jointly convened by the Aborigines Protection Society and the Anti-Slavery Society, was held at Westminster Palace Hotel. Mr. A. Pease, M.P., presided, and among those present were Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Lewis Fry, M.P., and Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P. A resolution moved by Mr. Bhownaggree and seconded by Sir W. Wedderburn, was unanimously carried, protesting against "the measures now being taken by the Amír of Afghanistan for the subjugation of the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush," declaring that "this ancient and heroic community ought, in the interests of science as well as of civilisation and humanity, to be protected from the merciless attack which is being made upon their lives, property, and social organisation," and earnestly appealing to Her Majesty's Government "promptly and vigorously to exert its influence with Her Majesty's highly subsidised ally the Amír by requiring that the present persecution shall be abandoned and the Kafirs left in possession of their hardly acquired liberties and their historic landmarks."

Lord George Hamilton, M.P., has appointed Mr. Gerald Loder, M.P., to be his "private Secretary for Parliamentary purposes." Mr. Loder, who has represented Brighton since 1889, is the fourth son of the late Sir Robert Loder. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, and called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1888. He was for some time private secretary to Mr. Ritchie at the Local Government Board. Mr. Loder is described as "a Conservative, and supporter of the Liberal Unionist alliance with the Conservative party." The description seems to suggest that there are Conservatives who do not support that alliance.

We take the following from the *Times* of February 19th:—"At a meeting of the East Indian Association, at their rooms, Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street, on Monday, (February 17th) Sir Lepel Griffin presiding, Mr. Alfred Nundy read a paper on the Indian National Congress. The chairman in his opening remarks, said that Mr. Nundy was well known to most of them as one who had won his spurs as a barrister in the Madras Presidency, and had made himself an authority on the subject under notice. It had been said that the question was one with which the association had nothing to do, but the council in no way took that view of the matter. Any question in which a large part of the most educated and intelligent of the Indian people took interest came within the scope of the discussions of the association.

"Mr. Nundy spoke of the Congress under two heads—first its members and then its objects. He said that the resolutions passed at the Congress were not unreasonable or extravagant. Some of these demands had already been partially granted by the Government, the reasonableness of others had been recognised, and others could claim in their support promises made by the Government in years past and the opinion of some of the most competent authorities of the present day. The demands were made by men who, at the sacrifice of much time and trouble and expense, met every year to discuss questions of the most vital importance to the millions who formed the population of India. It was true that, so far as the masses were concerned, the Congress had no direct authority to speak for them, but in the history of most civilised nations it would be seen the educated and reflecting classes represented the views and interests of those who, through ignorance or other causes, were incapable of asserting their own grievances. The National Congress could not be reproached for overlooking their interests, for a great many of the resolutions passed had special reference to their wants and requirements. It might be said that the aim of the Congress was to bring together all the conflicting elements, and to combine them into one harmonious whole, to act as the medium of communication between the Government on the one hand and the people of India on the other, and to consolidate the union between England and India by securing the introduction of such reforms as were desirable in the interests of the people. India knew the advantages of British rule, but these reforms would have to be effected."

At the National Indian Association's soirée held on February 13th, in the East Conference Hall of the Imperial Institute, the guests were received by Lady Lyall, Lady Bayley, and Miss Manning (hon. sec.). Among those present were Sir Alfred Lyall, Sir Steuart Bayley, the newly-appointed Governor of Madras (Sir Arthur Havelock) and Lady Havelock, Mr. and Mrs. Carmichael, Colonel Mackenzie (late Resident at Haidarabad) and Mrs. Mackenzie, Dr. Theodore Cooke, Mr. and Mrs. Barclay Scriven, Mrs. Keatinge, Mr. Thornton, C.S.I., a young chief from Kathiawar, Mrs. Gupta and two daughters, Miss Cock, M.D., Mr. Alex. Rogers, Colonel Maude, Miss Toynbee, Mr. Candy, Miss Plumptre, Shrimant Sampatrao, brother of the Gaekwar of Baroda, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Nundy, Mr. A. Doe, Prof. and Mrs. Cavalier, Miss S. Chattopadhya, Mr. Martin Wood, and Mr. Geflowski. Many nationalities were represented, and some of the Indian costumes were very rich in gold and colours. There was a good programme of music, which included songs by Madame Pheroze Langrana, in her finished and graceful style, a humorous "sketch" by Mr. R. K. Sorabji, and a song by a lady from Calcutta, Miss Helen Le Franc. Conversation was very general, and a most sociable spirit pervaded the assembly, which was unique in the mingling of East and West.

The new volume of the *Liberal Magazine* (Liberal

Publication Department, Parliament Street) is an invaluable compendium of the events of last year. Besides a political diary and brief extracts from the more important political speeches, it contains useful monthly appendices dealing with current questions, recent legislation, and so forth. The articles signed "A. B."—initials which imperfectly conceal the name of that brilliant critic and essayist, Mr. Augustine Birrell—are masterpieces in their way. Not the least admirable feature of the volume is an index, which seems to be tolerably complete, though we detect some curious omissions. The idea of the compilation as a whole is so excellent as to deserve more scientific execution. The plan of "setting out" subjects in tabular form might well be developed, and the best speeches reproduced in skeleton outline. Even in its present form the volume is, if not a possession for ever, at least a valuable storehouse of facts for future use.

THE CHITRAL DEBATE.

DIVISION LIST.

The following is the list of members of the House of Commons who, in the division on February 17th, voted in favour of Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the Address:—

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.).
*Baker, Sir John.
*Burns, John.
Caldwell, James.
Cameron, Robert.
Causton, Richd. Knight.
*Channing, F. Allston.
*Clough, Walter Owen.
*Commins, Andrew.
*Condon, Thomas Jos.
Crean, Eugene.
Daly, James.
*Dalziel, James Henry.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan).
Davitt, Michael.
Dillon, John.
*Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George.
Ellis, Thomas Edward (Merionethshire).
*Esmonde, Sir Thomas.
Evans, Samuel T.
Farrell, James P. (Cavan, W.).
Ffrench, Peter.
*Field, Wm. (Dublin).
Finucane, John.
Foster, Sir. Walter (Derby Co.).
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. H. J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford.
*Grey, Sir Ed. (Berwick).
*Griffiths, Ellis J.
Haldane, Richd. Burdon.
*Harrington, Timothy.
Harrison, Charles.
Harwood, George.
Hazell, Walter.
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth).
Jameson, Major J. E.
Joicey, Sir James.
Kenny, Joseph E. (Dublin, Col. Green).
*Kilbride, Denis.
Knox, Ed. Francis Vesey.
Labouchere, Henry.
Langley, Batty.
*Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumberland).
*Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington).
*Lewis, John Herbert.
Lloyd-George, David.
*Lough, Thomas.
*Lyell, Sir Leonard.
Macaleese, Daniel.
*MacNeill, J. G. Swift.
*M'Cartan, Michael.
M'Dermott, Patrick.
M'Leod, John.
*Mandeville, J. Francis.
Morley, Charles.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny).
O'Connor, A. (Donegal).
Pease, J. A. (Northumb).
*Pickersgill, Ed. Hare.
Redmond, Wm. (Clare).
*Roberts, J. B. (Eifion).
*Roberts, John H. (Denbighs).
Robson, Wm. Snowdon.
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees).
Shee, James John.
*Sheehy, David.
*Smith, Samuel (Flint).
*Spicer, Albert.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath).
Tanner, Charles Kearns.
*Thomas, A. (Glam., E.).
Thomas, D. A. (Merthyr).
Tully, Jasper.
*Weir, James Galloway.
Williams, J. C. (Notts.).
*Wilson, John (Govan).
Yoxall, James Henry.

Tellers for the Ayes, Sir William Wedderburn* and Mr. Schwann*.

* Denotes member of the Indian Parliamentary Committee.

"THE CHITRAL BLUNDER."

There is, happily, good reason to believe that the "forward" frontier policy, as it is called, is coming to be regarded in the true light by a considerable section of the British public. To be condemned—except by young officers who, like Captain Costigan, are not only brave but know it too, and like to take out their courage and, as it were, give it an airing in company—it needs only to be understood. Detested by the people of India, and denounced by the majority and the best of military "experts," this baneful policy is directly responsible for the present embarrassed condition of Indian finances. Witness the authority of two such capable judges as Sir David Barbour and Sir Auckland Colvin, both of them ex-Finance Ministers. Strategically, it is condemned by men like General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, Sir Donald Stewart, and Sir Charles Gough. It reverses the settled policy of the Government of India, approved by the people of India, under Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, and Lord Ripon. It was invented by Mr. Disraeli and Lord Salisbury, and initiated by Lord Lytton. Since its inauguration in 1878 it has cost the people of India more than thirty millions of money, and it is not merely useless but positively dangerous. Its ostensible purpose is to diminish the danger of Russian invasion. Yet it literally paves the way for the Russian invader, while, through an unceasing drain upon impoverished taxpayers, it saps the contentment of the people of India. "The paramount consideration in my mind," wrote Lord Lawrence in 1867 in a famous minute, "has always been, and still is, a regard for the true interests of the State. I am convinced that we can gain nothing, but are pretty sure to lose a great deal in prestige, in honour, in the valuable lives of our officers and soldiers, by interfering actively in the affairs of Central Asia; and that, so far from strengthening our tenure of India, we may thus shake it to its very foundations." Lord Lawrence is voted old-fashioned by young military officers afflicted by "K.C.B.-mania." Accordingly, in the year of grace, 1895, we find our Chauvinists at Simla advancing from Peshawar to Chitral—more than the distance from London to Manchester—and deliberately throwing away the advantages of the colossal mountain barrier which had hitherto sepa-

rated British Indian territory from the hypothetical Russian invader.

If the brothers Younghusband, in their interesting and tell-tale volume entitled "The Relief of Chitral," had confined themselves, as they might well have done, to purely military incidents, the foregoing remarks would, of course, have been out of court. But they have done nothing of the kind. On the contrary, they give us a preliminary chapter which purports to explain "the causes of the war," and a final chapter which purports to describe "the present situation." These chapters, grossly imperfect and misleading as they are, inevitably become the most important section of the book. For the immediate military campaign is done and over, and we did not need to be told with what courage, resolution, and loyalty our soldiers, whether British or Indian, carried out, in the teeth of grave dangers and unique natural obstacles, the orders which they ought never to have received. Two questions, however, remain. How came the relief of Chitral to be necessary at all? And how many more escapades of a similar kind is the Indian taxpayer and the Lancashire cotton spinner to expect in the future? The brothers Younghusband, whose account of the military operations is adequate enough, though of course it is written in the style not of Thucydides but of "special correspondents," answer these questions not so much by what they say as by what they omit. If, however, we supplement their narrative from external sources it becomes luminous and valuable. In the Blue-book on Chitral which was recently published the very first despatch showed that, so long ago as 1877, the Government of India had designs upon Chitral. It was not until the ingenuity of eighteen years had been expended that the desirable situation was realised—in which it became plausibly necessary to relieve a British force. It was then the old story. British soldiers were in danger and needed to be rescued. Then, in Mr. Balfour's formula, where the British soldier had been, a Tory Government determined that he must remain. The first chapter of the volume before us resolves itself, unintentionally, into a narrative of British endeavours, especially from Gilghit, to secure or manufacture some reason for active intervention in the affairs of Chitral, while the final chapter indicates gravely enough the dangers that remain.

The opportunity for intervention came when, after the death of Aman-ul-Mulk, and the murder of his second son, Afzul-ul-Mulk, Sher Afzul, the uncle of the latter, established himself as Mehtar. The British officer at Gilghit, gratuitously and offensively, then dispatched a British force with the weakling Nizam-ul-Mulk to drive out Sher Afzul. Sher Afzul fled back without delay into Afghanistan, Nizam-ul-Mulk became nominal ruler, and the British hold upon Chitral seemed to be as secure as it was aggressive and uncalled for. Nizam-ul-Mulk was afterwards shot by his half-brother, Amir-ul-Mulk, and Chitral was "invaded" by Umra Khan. *Hinc illae lacrimae.* But to describe these events or any of them as the cause of the Chitral imbroglio is to confuse the occasion, and almost the effects, with the cause. The cause lay deep down in the persistent policy of ambitious soldiers, abetted by weak viceroys, which ever since the seventies has waxed under a Tory and waned under a Liberal Government. The amusing thing is that the brothers Younghusband talk of "we," "we," "we," as if it were British money that was squandered in Chitral. But, of course, it was Indian money, just as it is Indian money that keeps the India Office going, and pays Lord George Hamilton's salary. It is also amusing to find these military chroniclers talking about the Chitral trouble as "upon the northern frontier of India." It was, of course, some hundreds of miles beyond that frontier. Elsewhere, indeed, our authors explain (p. 56) that "four high ranges of mountains, and three considerable rivers, besides mountain torrents, had to be crossed by the southern column of the relief force." It does not seem to have occurred to them that in describing the difficulties of the march and the hardships of the troops they were describing means of protection against Russia, which the "forward" policy will impair or remove. Still less do the brothers Younghusband appear to appreciate the singular folly of embittering or annihilating the indigenous tribesmen of the mountains, who value their independence before their lives. It has been well said that in politics, as in physics, where there is no resistance there is no support. The agents of the "forward" policy depose strong men in order to set up puppets, subservient to themselves. Their crowning achievement in Chitral was to enthrone Shuja-ul-Mulk, "an intelligent, trustworthy little boy, nine or ten years old." The Younghusbands of this best of all possible worlds are convinced of the paramount necessity of teaching the "wild impressionable people across our frontier" to believe in our "unwavering consistency of purpose." Apparently the best mode of enforcing the lesson is first to issue a proclamation saying that we intend to withdraw from their territory, and then, having issued it, to remain.—*The Star.*

THE MAHARAJA OF JHALWAR.

"A PLEA FOR FAIR HEARING."

Under the headings "Prince and Political; Mahárája of Jhalwar; A Plea for Fair Hearing," the *Daily Chronicle* of February 20th published the following:

We have received the following cable from Mr. Motilal, editor of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, Calcutta, a well-known organ of Indian native opinion, concerning the case of the Prince of Jhalwar. We cannot, of course, vouch for our correspondent's facts, but the case seems to us eminently one for careful enquiry and cautious action:—

Calcutta, *Thursday.*

The Jhalwar telegrams in the *Times* are misleading, for they are summarised from the *Pioneer*, which is admittedly the organ of the political agents. An ancestor of the Jhalwar Prince did inestimable service to the Government during the Mutiny. The present Prince saved the political agent, Mr. Saddler, from a tiger, though Mr. Saddler was inimical to him before. The previous politicals spoke favourably,

but the present political disagreed in minor matters, and sent a report of the charges against the Prince, unknown to the Prince or the public. The *Pioneer* says the Prince contemplated rebellion against politicals, and was serving ball cartridge to his troops. The charge is absurd, as, according to the *Pioneer*, the Prince has about 200 ill-armed troops. The *Pioneer* again shifted its ground, and charged the Prince with intimidating the agent with a revolver. The Prince indignantly denies this, and says he saw the agent alone and unarmed. The politicals are urging the Viceroy to depose the Prince unheard. This has created an intense sensation throughout the country. Indian Princes are alarmed, and the public demand an open enquiry. So does the Prince. The Jhalwar subjects petitioned the Government on behalf of their popular Prince.

Accounts of the Patna Prince's suicide, supposed to have been committed under a sense of official wrong, whose redress was not expected, has brought the Jhalwar case to the front for the prevention of similar mischief. It will be disgraceful if the Prince is deposed unheard. Particulars have been sent to Mr. Caine.

In a leading article published on the same day the *Chronicle* wrote:—

We publish in another column a telegram sent to us by the editor of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta. The statements contained in his message and in the files of his journal, which we have before us seem to us to call for close examination by the Home Government. All the information that the country has had before it up to the present as to the proceedings against the Máháràja of Jhalawar has come through the *Times*. In a couple of telegrams from its Calcutta correspondent it has been stated that the Máháràja has been playing the tyrant and misgoverning his State, that a reign of terror was established in his capital of Jhalra Patan, and that Captain Evans-Gordon, the Political Agent had suggested to the Government last October that Jahlim Singh, the Máháràja, was unfit to govern. We are further informed that Mr. Crosthwaite, a high official was sent by the Indian Government to make enquiries. On arriving in the capital, in December, this gentleman discovered "that affairs had almost reached a critical state," and that the Máháràja was serving out ammunition to his Sepoys, and was engaging Pathan mercenaries. So grave was the condition of affairs that two squadrons of the Central India Horse and a couple of companies of the Deoli Irregular Force were ordered up to the capital as a protection to the Political Agent, and there they remain. The *Times* correspondent further suggested that the Máháràja was not always fully responsible for his actions, and that he had long shown signs of eccentricity. This explanation, we may remark in passing, seems to be a familiar one to Indian officials. Last June the Prince of Patna after being subjected to a long term of harsh and humiliating treatment at the hands of the Political Agent, shot his wife and then committed suicide. The official view of the case, according to the *Times*, was one of insanity. The Chief Commissioner explained that the Máháràja was undoubtedly insane; indeed he had shown eccentricities of conduct and outbursts of temper ever since his accession in 1894. The Agent's view may, or may not, have been correct; but it would almost seem as if a political agent who has differences with the native princes has only to follow Dr. Blandford's procedure in the Lanchester case in order to bring the delinquent to subjection. Meanwhile, however, these two incidents have created a profound feeling throughout India. The Máháràja of Jhalwar is virtually a prisoner; a claimant to the throne has been put in command of his troops; and his deposition may be expected at any moment. One cannot wonder that the three hundred native princes and the millions of subjects under their rule should be closely watching the turn of events, and asking, anxiously enough, whether justice will be done.

Of course, if the Prince is guilty of the charges made against him, if in a fit of insanity or in cold blood he armed his 200 Sepoys with ball cartridges, as the *Pioneer* alleges, with a view to intimidate Mr. Crosthwaite and the Political Agent, the sooner he is put out of harm's way the better. But it will never do for a couple of officials to decide such a matter. The Máháràja is entitled to a fair hearing and a judicial verdict. That is all that he asks for, and in the interests of justice and of the good government of India it is the least that can be done. What is there to be said on the other side? The Máháràja came to the throne in 1883—a youth of twenty. He was deprived almost at once of his full powers by the Political Agent, wisely, for all we know, princes of such tender years not always being infallible. But in 1894 his full powers were restored to him, and Mr. Urwin, the Political Agent, who left the district in March last year, gave a good record of the Prince, and his name was favourably mentioned in the last administrative report. In April, Captain Gordon arrived on the scene, the control being thus transferred from a civilian to a military man. Friction seems to have arisen in the summer between the two. No specific charges have been made public, but the misgovernment of the Máháràja must have been very bad indeed to warrant Captain Gordon's suggestion of deposition which was made last autumn. The Government hesitated to act upon the information in their possession; fresh charges were made by the Agent; in the end Mr. Crosthwaite was sent down; and immediately on his arrival the story of the ball cartridges and the Sepoys—the truth of which is entirely denied by the Prince—made its appearance. Now we express no opinion on the case. Captain Gordon may be justified up to the hilt in all he has done. He may have acted with tact and fairness, as well as decision, and the Máháràja may be a light-headed incapable. All we have to urge at the moment is that the case should be thoroughly sifted. If the Indian Government shirks the duty, then the India Office must keep them up to the mark. And if Lord George Hamilton fails, then Parliament must ask him for an explanation. Captain Gordon may be another Havelock, and this Prince a second Tippoo, but that is no reason for our behaving in a despotic and arbitrary way. Our

agents exercise absolute power over the Princes and peoples of India, and we must do our best to see that this power is not turned into a mere display of martial law.

Mr. Herbert Roberts, M.P., gave notice, for February 24th, of the following question in the House of Commons :—

"To ask the Secretary of State for India, if his attention has been called to the charges brought by the political agent at Jhalwar against the Máháràja Rana of that State, accompanied with a recommendation to the Viceroy for his deposition; if so, what action has been taken by the Government of India with regard to these charges :

"Will His Highness have every opportunity afforded to him to defend himself publicly from these charges before any definite action is taken with regard to the recommendation for his deposition :

"And, will the Secretary of State lay upon the Table of the House any papers and correspondence relating to this difficulty in Jhalwar."

In reply to Mr. Roberts Lord G. Hamilton said :

"My answer to the first part of the first question is in the affirmative, and to the second part that the reports of the political agent as to the oppression existing have been examined on the spot by the newly-appointed agent to the Governor-General, whose report is under the consideration of Lord Elgin. The Máháràja will be allowed every opportunity of submitting his reply to these charges. As soon as I have received the final decision of the Viceroy I will consider if papers relating to this subject can be laid upon the Table of the House."

Mr. Roberts has also given notice of the following motion, for which no day has yet been fixed :—

"India (political resident at Jhalwar),—To call attention to the recent differences between the political resident at Jhalwar and the Máháràja Rana of that State; and to move, That, in the opinion of this House, the arrangements under which political residents are selected and appointed are unsatisfactory and require careful reconstruction."

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE IN INDIA.

MEMORANDUM ISSUED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Under the title "Memorandum on the Separation of Judicial from Executive (especially Police and Revenue) Duties in India," the British Committee of the Indian National Congress has just issued to Parliament, the Press, and others, a compilation of the authoritative statements which have lately appeared in our columns. The Memorandum, to which we refer in "Indiana," consists of sixteen foolscap pages, and opens with the following "Introductory Note," signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., as Chairman of the British Committee :—

1. The present Memorandum owes its somewhat unusual form to the circumstances under which it has been drawn up. In November last the well-known Indian barrister, Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who was then staying in London, made an important statement to a representative of "India" upon the injustice and dangers arising from the combination of Judicial and Executive functions in the same officers in India. Mr. Ghose's statement attracted the notice of Sir Richard Garth, who described it as thoroughly well considered and deserving of great respect, and suggested that it should be sent to every member of Parliament, both Lords and Commons. It is in order to carry out Sir Richard Garth's suggestion that the following documents have been brought together. They include, besides Mr. Ghose's statement and Sir Richard Garth's letter, brief expressions of sympathetic opinion by Lord Hobhouse, Sir Richard Couch, Sir John Phear, Sir R. T. Reid, Sir William Markby, and Sir Raymond West, together with a scheme, prepared in 1893 by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt and approved by Sir Richard Garth, for carrying out the proposed reform. Mr. Dutt's scheme referred to Bengal, the Presidency, that is, into which it had been declared that the reform could not be introduced because it involved additional expenditure of prohibitive amount. Similar schemes for other Presidencies and Provinces had been framed, but it was understood that the most serious financial difficulty was apprehended in Bengal. Lord Dufferin was probably impressed with this opinion when, as Viceroy, he referred to the petition of the Indian National Congress for the Separation of Judicial and Executive functions as a "counsel of perfection" which the Government of India was, by the state of the finances at that time, prevented from accepting.

2. Mr. Manomohan Ghose's statement is reproduced here as it originally appeared, without omission, alteration, or addition. It deals, however, not only with the separation of Judicial and Executive functions, but also with the distinct, though collateral, question of the freedom of the Judiciary from pressure on the part of the Executive. It is the purpose of the present Memorandum to direct attention to the first of these questions—to the evils inseparable from a system under which the chief Executive official of a district collects the revenue, controls the police, institutes prosecutions, and at the same time exercises large and preponderating Judicial powers in the same district. Mr. Manomohan Ghose demonstrates the nature and gravity of these evils, and illustrates his statements by means of authentic examples drawn from his own experience.

3. The subject is not new. On the contrary, as Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt remarks, a Commission appointed to report on the police declared so long ago as 1860 that "judicial and police functions" ought not to be "mixed up and confounded," and the present system has not only been consistently condemned by high legal authorities, by Anglo-Indian officers of all parties, and by independent public opinion in India, but has also provoked the censure of two successive Secretaries of State, Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley. The only semblance of argument against a reform demanded by such a chorus of voices and with such unanswerable force, is the allegation that it would be too costly. If this theory is still held in any quarter, it is disposed of, at once and for all, by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, who shows in detail, and with the authority of experience in the several offices concerned, that the reform might be accomplished without any addition

to expenditure. Even if Mr. Dutt's statements were not regarded as conclusive, a practical experiment might at least be made in a single Division, where the "counsel of perfection" could be adopted without risking any considerable increase of expenditure.

THE SOCIAL CONFERENCE.

NINTH SESSION.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTIONS.

We give below the text of the resolutions carried at the Ninth Session of the Indian Social Conference, which met at Poona last December :—

I.—EXTENSION OF FEMALE EDUCATION.

RAO BAHADUR LALSHUNKER, of Ahmedabad, moved that, while expressing its satisfaction with the efforts that had been made by various private societies and Samajas in Calcutta, Bombay, Poona, Ahmedabad, Jalandhar, and other cities, and by the native States of Baroda and Mysore, for the promotion of higher female education, either by the establishment of high schools, or by opening home classes or giving lectures to grown-up ladies, or by holding periodical examinations for awarding prizes to those who studied at home, this Conference still considered that further organised efforts must be made to secure a wider extension of female education, as regards the numbers of scholars attending and the standards taught in primary and secondary schools, so as to bring it to the level of the education of boys; and the Conference recommended that all social reform associations in the country should recognise the claims of this reform upon their attention, and endeavour to the best of their power to secure the support of private and public funds for such extension.

II.—TEMPERANCE IN INDIA.

Professor ABAJI VISHNU KATHWATE proposed the second resolution, declaring that the Conference noted with pleasure that—thanks to the noble efforts made by Mr. W. S. Caine, Rev. Mr. Evans, and their native fellow-workers—considerable success had attended the efforts of the Kayastha Temperance Society and similar other organisations for the promotion of total abstinence, and it felt more than ever the necessity of active co-operation between the temperance movements in India, and in England and America. The vice was not of ancient growth here, and was still confined to minorities; and it was in the opinion of the Conference necessary that the majority of total abstainers should exert themselves to popularise their views, and to obtain the power of enforcing them by some adaptation of the principle of local option, which could not be secured without the co-operation of the English and American temperance societies.

III.—THE ANTI-NAUTCH MOVEMENT.

Mr. RAMANBHAI, of Ahmedabad, moved that the Conference recorded its satisfaction that the *anti-nautch* movement had found such general support in all parts of India, and recommended the various social reform associations in the country to persevere in the adoption of this self-denying ordinance, and to supplement it by pledging their members to adhere to the cardinal principle of observing on all occasions as a religious duty purity of thought, speech, and action, so as to purge their society generally of the evils of low and immoral surroundings.

IV.—MUHAMMADANS AND HINDUS.

Mr. ALI MAHOMED BHIMJI proposed the fourth resolution, which set forth that, while it was a matter of general satisfaction that the relations between the Hindus and Muhammadans in the North-West Provinces and Oudh had assumed their normal character of mutual help and toleration, the Conference regretted that their relations had not been equally satisfactory in some parts of the Presidency of Bombay and the Puujab, and there had been unfortunate misunderstandings between the Hindus and the native Christians, in one or two places in the Madras Presidency. The Conference recommended to all social reform associations that it was their first duty to cultivate friendly relations with the professors of all creeds, and they should lend their active support to the efforts made by the Government to establish a better understanding between all classes, by pressing for the creation of mixed conciliation boards to settle misunderstandings before they broke out in open violence.

V.—RE-ADMISSION TO CASTE.

Mr. D. G. GARUD moved that the Conference noted with satisfaction that there now existed no difficulty in the admission of foreign-travelled people among the Khatri and Shikh communities of the Punjab, and that the admission of similar people in Guzerat and Southern India had been secured during the present year on more easy conditions than were possible some years ago. The Conference recommended these examples to the Kayastha community in the north-western provinces, where more difficulty had been experienced, and to the Brahmans and other high castes in all parts of the country among whom the prejudice against foreign travel by sea was still strong. The earnest co-operation of the caste and ecclesiastical leaders must be enlisted in this work, as the final success of all the political, industrial, and social activities rested on this movement.

VI.—INTERCOMMUNION BETWEEN SUB-CASTES.

On the motion of Mr. GOVIND BAPUJEE JOSHI, it was resolved that "the Conference notes with pleasure that the reports of some of the associations display very praiseworthy efforts in some places to bring about intercommunion between the members of sub-castes or subdivisions. Unless some such fusion is encouraged in all the smaller castes, no practical reform even as regards marriage customs as existing in some of the castes is permanently possible; and it is on this and other accounts that the Conference recommends all social reform associations to direct their efforts to secure the reunion of the smaller divisions."

VII.—MARRIAGE CUSTOMS AND LAWS.

PUNDIT MALVIYA proposed the seventh resolution,

as follows:—"The Conference notes with pleasure that the very earnest efforts made in some of the highest Brahman families to raise the marriageable age of girls and boys in the Maharashtra country, and in some other parts of Northern India, have been attended with considerable success, and the weakness of the opposition made leads to the hope that further persistence in this direction will soon raise the tone of the national sentiment on this question, so as to secure a return to the old traditions of Vedic and Epic times. (*b*) The Conference further expresses its satisfaction that the marriage laws passed by his Highness the late Máháraja have worked well in Mysore, and the fact that the breaches of the the law were brought to the notice of the authorities by neigbours encourages the hope that public sentiment is slowly rousing itself to the evils of this custom. (*c*) The action of the ecclesiastical head Ackarya in Maharastra, in solemnly condemning the practice of the sale of girls, is a matter which sug-suggests the hope that the time has now come when this evil custom, so opposed to all old traditions and sense of human dignity, will be discountenanced by all classes of the community and fall into disuse. (*d*) It is also a matter of great satisfaction that the Governments of Bengal, North-Western Provinces, and the Punjab have interested themselves in the discouragement of extravagant expenditure in marriage and death ceremonies. The various caste organisations have anticipated such action in many places, and it may be hoped that these communities, helped by Government, will soon be enabled to enforce their regulations upon their own recalcitrant members without hitch or danger of schism."

VIII.—Re-marriage of Widows.

Rao Bahadur Gunpatrao Manker moved the eighth resolution, as follows: "The Conference expresses its satisfaction that this year, as in the two or three years past, some ten marriages of widows have taken place—five in the Presidency of Bombay, one in Madras, and four in the Punjab; and it congratulates Devan Santrama, of Lahore, on the moral courage shown by him in this connection. The Conference hopes that in Bengal, where the movement had its first origin, and the misery of child-widows is enhanced by Koolin polygamy, special efforts will be made to honour the memory of the late Pandit Vidyasagar, by supporting the movement dear to his heart. As long as the miserable condition of the child-widow fails to move the people, there can be no happy home in the land; and the Conference accordingly recommends all the social reform associations to support this cause by their active sympathy and personal help."

IX.—Disfigurement of Child-Widows.

Mr. K. Nalarayan, editor of the *Indian Social Reformer*, proposed the ninth resolution: "The practice of disfigurement in the case of child-widows is an enormity which must be put down by strenuous private efforts in all places, and the widows be educated, and thus taught to help themselves, and earn their own livelihood, and be helpful to those with whom their lot is cast by reason of their misfortune."

X.—Condition of the Pariahs.

It was resolved "that the Conference notes with satisfaction that, in the Madras Presidency, the attention of Government and the public has been forcibly drawn to the condition of the Pariah caste, who, by reason of their neglect by caste-Hindus, are tempted to give up their faith, and become converts to other creeds. The education and social amelioration of these out-castes, in all parts of India, is a duty which devolves upon all those who have the permanent good of their country at heart, and every effort should be made to raise these classes to a position where, by education and industry, they may rise above the disadvantages of their condition."

XI.—Admission of Converts into Hindu Society.

Mr. Sevaklal Kursondas, addressing the assembly in Hindustani, proposed "that the Conference welcomes the efforts made in the Central Provinces, Madras, and the Punjab to admit into Hindu society converts to other religion, and the Conference hopes that the people everywhere will try to follow in the same footsteps."

XII.—Restitution of Conjugal Rights.

Rao Bahadur Bhat moved that the Conference recorded its regret that the Supreme Legislative Council abandoned, in Committee, the proposal to give discretionary power to the Judges to enforce restitution of conjugal rights by imprisonment, and rejected even the modified motion brought by the Hon. Mr. Mehta on the subject. The Conference hoped that the subject would soon engage the attention of Government, so as to remedy the evil which had been partly created by its own enactments.

Reviews.

THE STORY OF THE DECCAN.

A History of the Deccan. By J. D. B. Gribble. In 2 vols. With Portraits, Maps, Plates, and Illustrations. Vol. I. (London: Luzac and Co.)

Mr. Gribble has done good historical service in gathering and piecing together a great variety of materials into a continuous history of the Deccan. He disclaims originality, and boldly announces that he has helped himself without a scruple to everything that promised to be useful for his purpose, find it wherever he might. He has made free with Elliott and Dawson, and he has gleaned much excellent and interesting material from the Bombay Gazetteers of the various Deccan districts. For a most interesting episode of Bijapur history he has laid under contribution Colonel Meadows Taylor's fine historical romance, "A Noble Queen." The only objection that the reader is likely to raise is, that Mr. Gribble has not always succeeded in fitting his materials together in a very artistic style. The dovetailing is somewhat rough. Better that, however, than lack of the materials. Perhaps, too, some blame must rest upon the fact that the author did not have an opportunity of putting the finishing touches to his proofs. There are many blunders throughout the

volume, which indicate that Mr. Gribble's own eyes did not see his book through the press. This is a pity, especially in a really handsome volume, although it does not detract from the essential value of the narrative. After all, the printing is very creditable—for Amsterdam. When Mr. Gribble has published his second volume he will fairly be regarded as having performed for the Deccan the literary service that Tod, Wilks, and Grant Duff performed so ably for Rajputana, Mysore, and the Mahrattas. His work is a welcome reclamation of another large and important tract of historical jungle.

Mr. Gribble proposes to trace the history of the Deccan from the commencement of the fourteenth century down to the establishment of the present dynasty—a period of four centuries, full of blood and struggle, full also of the most interesting and romantic episodes. The present volume covers some three-quarters of the period. The first division deals mainly with the House of Bahmani and the rise of the kingdom of Vijayanagar. The second is chiefly concerned with the history of Bijapur, and with the fall of Vijayanagar and Golconda. The third contemplates the empire in ruins, and the rise of a new kingdom from the *débris*. "Beyond the Khyber Pass began to loom the shadow of the Persian conqueror, and in Maharashtra a nation had been formed that was to make a bid for the empire. It did so, and failed; and in the meanwhile in the west and the east and the north-east the small clouds of British power, at the time scarcely bigger than a man's hand, gradually increased in size, until a few years later the English were called in, first as the aids, and then as the arbiters, of the Muhammadan emperors." The whole story, if often gruesome and repulsive, is also often picturesque, and always eminently instructive.

"Indian history," says Mr. Gribble, "is for the most part a record of daring adventurers, who gain power and sometimes the throne by a series of crimes, and utilise it for purposes of extortion, tyranny and and oppression." The generalisation is amply supported by the history of the Deccan, notwithstanding occasional contrasts of the most remarkable kind, such as the Sultan Alla-ud-Din and Asaf Jah, at the beginning and the end of the present volume. The story commences with the destruction of the Hindu kingdoms of Warangal and Deogiri, and the plundering incursions of the Muhammadan armies far away to the south; while the Hindus, driven from Warangal and the Telingana, have founded a new kingdom at Vijayanagar, destined to prove for two centuries and a half a bulwark against further invasion. The lunacies of Mahomed Tughlak Shah (Mr. Gribble is made to spell his name half-a-dozen different ways) are outdone in interest by the remarkable story of Hassan, a field labourer for the first thirty years of his life, who eventually founded the dynasty of Bahmani, ascending the throne of the Deccan in 1347 as Sultan Alla-ud-Din.

"There are, unfortunately, but very slight materials for a history of the Sultan Alla-ud-Din, but those that exist are sufficent to show that he deserves a high place amongst the great men of the world's history. Born in the lowest ranks, he rose, by his own honesty of character, to be the founder of a great kingdom, and at no time was his career stained by cruelty or injustice. There are few characters in history that can compare with this, the first King of the Deccan, and there is probably no other nation in the world than the Muhammadan which can furnish the example of a peasant raising himself to the throne of a monarch, who retains throughout his career not only dignity of character, but honesty of purpose, and who relinquishes life with such humble piety and simplicity. Muhammadans of the Deccan may well be proud of the first founder of their rule."

A pretty good case might, indeed, be made out in favour of a Roman emperor or two on much the same lines—say, Diocletian, or Justin, or Justinian. Still it is pleasant to meet with such a man as Alla-ud-Din in such circumstances, and Mr. Gribble's praise of him must not be grudged. He was much the best of his house, of the Gulburga and Bieder sultans, though it is agreeable to find a son of his, Mahmood Shah (1378-96) "in the habit of saying that kings were only trustees of the divine riches, and that to expend more than was absolutely necessary was a breach of trust." It would be a singularly happy thing for India if this principle of Mahmood's prevailed in its governing counsels five hundred years after his time. Mahmood was the fifth of the Gulburga sultans, and appears to have laid to heart the wisdom of his father. During his reign great care appears to have been bestowed on education, schools being established in the principal towns; and much consideration seems to have been shown to the poor people. In the reign of Feroze Shah, the eighth sultan (1396-1422), there is a remarkable episode, the story of the lovely Pertal, daughter of a Hindu farmer, for whose sake the Sultan Feroze and the King of Vijayanagar warred on each other—the King of Vijayanagar, by the way, having some 12,000 wives already. In the reign of Muhammed Shah (1462-82) there comes into prominence another personage with a very romantic history. This was Yusuf Adil Khan. Yusuf was born in 1443, son of Murad, the Sultan of Turkey. On the death of Murad in 1450, Yusuf was threatened with the bow-string, but was saved by the address of his mother, who had him committed to the care of a slave-dealer, who carried him off to Persia, whence he made his way to Ahmedabad Bieder. There, by his personal qualities, he steadily rose until eventually he founded "another dynasty, which was to supplant the house of Bahmani and rule with splendour in the Deccan for nearly two hundred years, until at last conquered by the all-powerful Aurungzebe. This new dynasty was the Adil Shahi house of Bijapur."

Yusuf Adil Shah was eminently worthy of his success. He was a great soldier and statesman, "handsome in person," says Ferishta, "eloquent of speech, and eminent for his learning, liberality, and valour." His strong position is indicated by his daring to change the religion of his State from the Sunni to the Shiah creed; and his breadth of mind is shown by his tolerant proclamation to his subjects. "My faith for myself, and your faith, for yourselves." His private character, too, was temperate and virtuous; he had but one wife, a Hindoo lady. The most striking figure, however, in the history of the Adil Shahi dynasty is not named in the list of Sultans. That figure is Queen Chand, the wife and widow of Ali Adil (1257-79), the fifth in the line. She is Colonel Meadows Taylor's "Noble Queen,"

and his description of her may be well repeated here:

"Few in England know that the contemporary of our Queen Elizabeth in the Deccan kingdoms was a woman of equal abilty, of equal political talent, of equal, though in a different sense, education and accomplishments, who ruled over a realm as large, a population as large, and as intelligent, and as rich, as England; a woman who, surrounded by jealous enemies, preserved by her own personal valour and endurance her kingdom from destruction and partition; who, through all temptations and exercise of absolute power, was at once simple, generous, frank, and merciful, as she was chaste, virtuous, religious, and charitable—one who, among all the women of India, stands out as a jewel without flaw and beyond price."

Mr. Gribble narrates how Queen Chand, who was the sister of the Ahmednagar Sultan, accompanied her husband in his campaigns and rode by his side to battle; how, in times of peace, she had a large portion of the public affairs entrusted to her, and gave audiences and transacted business in open durbar; and how she was beloved by all, not only for her daring, but also for her justice and firmness. When Prince Murad, Akbar's son, came down on Ahmednagar with 30,000 men, Queen Chand, then nearly fifty years of age, responded to the call to undertake the Regency and the defence of the State. A breach being suddenly made in the walls, "several of the leading officers of the garrison prepared for flight."

"But Chand Bibi, clad in armour, and with a veil thrown over her face, and with a drawn sword in her hand, dashed forward to defend the breach. The fugitives to a man returned and joined her, and as the storming party held back for the other mines, the besieged had time to throw rockets, powder, and other combustibles into the ditch, and to bring guns to bear upon the breach. From the early morning until sundown, the heroic Queen remained in the breach, encouraging her soldiers and endeavouring to repair the damage. For some reason or other, the general assault was delayed until the afternoon, by which time the defenders were better prepared to resist it, but from about two o'clock until sunset force after force of Moguls was hurled against the breach to be each time repulsed, until the moat was filled with the bodies of the slain. Throughout the whole of this desperate attack, Queen Chand was foremost amongst the defenders. Her green veil was seen everywhere, and her voice was heard, calling out in its shrill treble her late husband's battle cry."

The attack failed, and the siege was raised. But in another siege, in 1599, Chand Bibi was cut down and died, "one of the noblest characters in the history of India." The Moguls now got firm footing in the Deccan, and the beginning of the end had commenced.

One more episode:—

"In the same year as Ahmednagar fell, an incident occurred which was destined to have a most important effect upon Indian history. During the Holi festival of that year (March-April), a Maratha named Majoli Bhonsla, who commanded a small body of Silleedar horse, took his son Shahji, a boy of five, to pay his respects to his commanding officer, Lukhji Jadhavrao. Lukhji's little daughter, Jiji, a child of three, was present, and, whilst the elders were talking, the two children began to play together. Lukhji asked his daughter, in joke: 'How would you like that boy for your husband?' and, on the girl saying 'Yes,' Majoli at once rose and called the guests to witness that Lukhji had offered his daughter in marriage to his son Shahji, which offer he, as Shahji's father, accepted. Taken thus at his word, Lukhji and his wife were exceedingly angry, but Majoli remained unshaken, and eventually (1604) the marriage really took place. The issue of this marriage was the great Sivaji, the founder of the Maratha nation."

We have dwelt mainly on the picturesque side of the history; but not only the political developments, but also the moral and material condition of the country will be found to be carefully traced and illustrated. The maps, portraits, and other illustrations add much to the value of the work. We shall look forward with interest to the appearance of the second volume.

"THE VALLEY OF KASHMIR."

The Valley of Kashmir. By Walter R. Lawrence, I.C.S., C.I.E., Settlement Commissioner, Kashmir and Jammu State. (Oxford University Press, 1895.)

The latest of the handsome publications on Indian matters from the Clarendon Press is the result and record of six years' work in Kashmir. The present settlement was commenced in 1887 by Mr. Wingate, who was succeeded by Mr. Lawrence in 1889, and the arrangements made under their guidance were finally confirmed in 1893. A comparison of the old administration and the new settlement would, under the guidance of Mr. Lawrence, lead us to the conclusion that Englishmen in general were archangels, and that the Political Department of the Government of India were gods. The truth is, unhappily, somewhat different. Everybody knows that there is another side to the picture painted by Mr. Lawrence, and those who remember the late Mr. Bradlaugh's speeches, and have read "Condemned Unheard," will take a due discount off Mr. Lawrence's inspired and *ex parte* statement of the political question. The picture which he presents of the unreformed, un-Anglicised Kashmir is black enough. The history of the State was, we are led to believe, a history of centuries of extortion and oppression. Taxation had steadily risen until it amounted to no less than three-fourths of the produce of the land, and although the proportion was reduced in 1860 to little more than half, this improvement was more than compensated by the wasteful methods of collection. Unjust assessments, the farming of taxes, and the embezzlement of sums which were entered as arrears against the various districts combined to bring about such a position of affairs that, while the revenue steadily rose on paper, it no less steadily declined in fact. Cultivators abandoned their holdings, and would have left the valley, had not the laws forbidden. Many of them went to swell the huge pauper population of the capital and to feed on the corn supplied there at State prices—a provision which is one of the most curious institutions of Srinagar. From time immemorial the villagers had been looked upon as inferior to the urban population, and in the interest of the latter payment of revenue in grain valued much below the market rate was customary, and the sale of produce by the cultivator prohibited. Collectors, boatmen and officials of all classes plundered and adulterated the grain, and lent their support to the maintenance of an oppressive system. The difficulties of transport in Kashmir produced another grievance, a system of *corvée* for the provision of carriers. But the Government of India has changed all this. A complete survey has been made, together with a new and equitable assessment, holders of land have been confirmed in their possessions, with hereditary right of occupancy, but without the

power to alienate land either by sale or mortgage. Cultivators have returned to their farms, and it has been found possible to repeal the prohibition of emigration; the *corvée* has been limited, and by the construction of a road to Gilghit its necessity is in great part obviated. The fictitious arrears of revenue have been remitted, the host of petty officials who took toll of all revenue is rapidly disappearing, and payment in kind with all its concomitant evils has been reduced to the actual limits imposed by the necessity of feeding the real poor of Srinagar, the remnants of the once flourishing shawl-weavers. And so the *couleur de rose* continues. With the support of the Máháraja and his Council, Mr. Lawrence has effected a social revolution. While the burden on the people has been lightened, the net revenue has been increased to such an extent that the cost of the settlement will be recouped within two years. Such is the impression conveyed by Mr. Lawrence. The transformation is as beneficent as it is complete. But it is really "all too bright and good for human nature's daily food." We will not, at this moment, dwell upon the other side of the picture, nor enquire how far the blame, under the old system, was due solely to the Máháraja, and how far the praise, under the new system, is due solely to the Government of India. The true history of Kashmir has yet to be written. Meantime, the question that Mr. Lawrence's narrative suggests is whether such improvements as have been made could not have been made equally well without the introduction of an exotic system, and certainly without the use of methods which, we fear, are only too acceptable to a certain *coterie* in the Government of India. English readers of this part of Mr. Lawrence's book should, in fairness, read "Condemned Unheard" as well.

Mr. Lawrence's survey of the history of Kashmir occupies, however, a comparatively small portion of the volume, which was "written for the State administration with the object of recording the statistics and resources of the valley." A mass of important information and figures bearing on religions, races, industries, flora, fauna, geology, agriculture, etc., attest the care and thoroughness of the survey, while the excellent chapters on archæology, scenery, and social life indicate the zest with which Mr. Lawrence undertook his task, in addition to providing a large amount of delightful pabulum for the purely general reader. Much has been written on Kashmir since Bernier visited the country in 1664 and wrote his account of "Cachemire, the Paradise of the Indies," and we have imbibed many notions of the wealth and splendour of the country from our early acquaintance with fairy tales anent beautiful princesses of Cachemire. But even examined in the dry light of official statistics and reports the country remains one of unsurpassed beauty and interest, and the people, though exhibiting in their character the effects of an unenviable history, are still entertaining and companionable. Originally a vast lake surrounded by towns, the ruins of which high up on the hills marked the original level of the water, the valley of Kashmir was laid bare when the water found an outlet at Baramula. The absence of easy means of egress and intercourse with the outer world has had its natural effect on the native population. The bulk of the traffic is carried on the Jehelum by boats which drift at the rate of a mile and a half an hour, a speed which is accepted as a kind of standard for the regulation of domestic matters in general. Consequently time is of no importance to the Kashmiri. Like other people of much leisure he is not over particular in the matter of cleanliness, but insists on warmth. In winter his sheep are penned in the ground floor of the house that they may warm the living room above; he also wears under his long robe an earthenware pot in a wicker case filled with hot embers to keep him warm. On the other hand he has no furniture and is content with a wash once in ten days. He is not without humour. A villager, who complained to Mr. Lawrence that his uncle had turned him out naked, received a present of European clothing, with the advice to behave like a European now that he was clothed as one. Next day the uncle came to complain, bearing on his person the marks of a severe castigation. Something too may be hoped from a man who will paddle till he drops rather than let a rival boatman pass him, and who takes kindly to cricket. When we remember how large a part in his history has been played by fire, famine, flood, and earthquake; how often cholera has swept the valley; and how small-pox, by its repeated devastations, has raised unto itself a deity to be propitiated and a ceremonial to be observed; we shall feel more kindly disposed towards his superstition and selfishness; with his history before us, we shall make allowances for his deficiency in truthfulness. Mr. Lawrence, of course, endorses the opinion that good government will reform the native population completely, and careful administration is already doing something to stamp out fire, famine, flood, and epidemic. Even with all its existing disadvantages, a country in which the traveller can find beautiful scenery, and by regulating the altitude of his abode, can enjoy the climate which suits him best; where even the dirty towns are undeniably picturesque; where the archæologist can find ruined temples that furnish opportunities for endless speculation on the eastward advance of Greek influence in art; where the sportsman can find the fullest gratification of his tastes; and where one of the highest ambitions of the prince is to render hospitality and assistance to all who travel in his domains—such a country must have

Insect Bites or Stings, Chafed Skin, Piles, Cuts, Sore Eyes, Sunburn, Earache, Neuralgic and Rheumatic Pains, Throat Colds, and Skin Ailments, Quickly Relieved by use of

CALVERT'S CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp, and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT and CO., MANCHESTER.

many attractions for European visitors. The first impulse that follows the reading of the volume before us suggests the enquiry, How do the trains run to Jammu?

The work is enriched by seventeen photographic plates, a map, and several charts; it is well indexed; and perfect letterpress, paper, and binding make a handsome book, worthy, so far as production is concerned, of the best traditions of the Clarendon Press.

MR. HAROLD SPENDER'S STORY.

At the Sign of the Guillotine. By Harold Spender (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

Mr. Spender has resorted to a fashion now much in vogue among a certain class of novelists, and sought his plot among the pages of French history. The scene of his novel opens at the time of the Revolution, when Robespierre was at the height of triumphant dictatorship, and practically ends with his fall. Dealing with public life in Paris at the time the book affords interesting portraits of such men as St. Just, Couthon, and Robespierre himself. The main outlines of the plot may be sketched as follows. The Deputy Bertrand Louvier, who has been absent from Paris on political business, returns to find that the Revolution, which he had hoped would secure prosperty and happiness to his native land, has plunged it into misery. He has for some years been attached to Elise Duplay, a girl who, like himself, belongs to the *bourgeois* class. Shortly after his arrival in Paris he becomes betrothed to her. The news reaches the ears of Robespierre, who lodges with the Duplays, and who has long cherished a secret attachment to Elise. He imprisons Louvier and releases him only after Elise has promised to marry himself. Thenceforward, the object of Louvier's life is to destroy his unscrupulous rival, and he becomes the leading spirit in the plots which ultimately bring the tyrant to the guillotine. When Robespierre has been removed from the path of the lovers, we recognise that the position has changed. Louvier is no longer a noble patriot, but an embittered man, who has poisoned his own soul in pursuit of revenge. He falls a victim to disease, and in his last moments consigns Elise to the care of De Saens, a somewhat philosophical nobleman who discharges the trust by marrying her and living in retirement for the rest of his life. Though the interest of the story is well maintained, this conclusion seems to us rather weak. Elise is perhaps the least satisfactory character in the book. That, in the last straits, to save her lover's life, she should consent to be betrothed to Robespierre, is admissible. That she should endure the position thus forced upon her for more than a year, during which her sentiments changed from esteem to abhorrence, is possible. But that she should afterwards calmly accept De Saens is, at least, unromantic. The Marquis de Saens is a man whom experience has gone far to make a cynic. He offers a striking contrast and analogy to Louvier. Both are in early manhood ardent Republicans, though severed so far in position, and both shrink in horror from the excesses perpetrated in the name of liberty. The Marquis describes his own feelings in the words: "I still hoped that good men would have courage to punish the miscreants, and to develope the good side of the Revolution. Nothing was done. I found myself in danger of perishing stupidly and causelessly, just mangled to death with a playful stroke of the great Revolutionary animal. At that I confess I determined to go. I left a France insane. I will go back to her when she has recovered her sanity." De Saens was in fact a man who had been compelled to part with the dream of his youth. But there seems to be no reason why he and Elise should be united on the strength of a common disappointment. Considerable liberty has of course been taken with some of the historical characters. Duplay, weak-minded and pompous as he appears, is yet an amiable representation of the bloodthirsty juryman of history. Robespierre, though the chief traits in his character, his personal vanity, cruelty and cowardice, are clearly shown, is nevertheless depicted as a man whose private life was altogether inestimable. Actual facts in such a case are too repulsive. Finally, we congratulate Mr. Spender on his first novel, in the confident belief that the promise he displays as a writer will bring him greater success in the future, and that his power of delineating character will be not less conspicuous on a canvass where he has a freer hand.

That invaluable handbook, *Whitaker's Almanack*, makes its twenty-ninth appearance and shows no decline from the excellence that characterised it under the editorship of its late founder, whose name has become a household word. *Whitaker* is the veritable *multum in parvo* of the commercial world and of the general reader. Its pages may be consulted for something about every thing, though not, perhaps, for every thing about any thing. The chapter on "The British Empire in India," for example, consists of some 26 pages of closely printed matter, and is a marvel of condensation. But it is unfortunate that the compiler of facts about Chitral forgets that the policy of occupation is a breach of faith. This summary bears the true official stamp. Criticism is, of course, out of the question in a book of reference, but a bare statement of the facts would have revealed the truth. We read *Whitaker*, but does *Whitaker* read India?

BIBLIOGRAPHY of ARTICLES in MONTHLY and QUARTERLY MAGAZINES on INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1896.

Gentlemen's Magazine. Reid, D. N., "Reminiscences of a Behar Planter."

Geographical Journal. Holditch, Col. T. H., "The Origin of the Kafir of the Hindu Kush."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street. S.W.). "The Social Conference at Poona." Dhingra, B.L., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., "Medical Aid to Indian Women."

Religious Review of Reviews. Meakin, J. E. Budgett, "The Beliefs of a Burmese Buddhist Monk."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1896.

Grinnell, George Bird .... "The Story of the Indian." (Chapman and Hall.) .... 6s. 0d.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.

583. (Legal.) India: Order in Council. Approving an Alteration in the Scheme for the Permanent Establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council .... 0s. 1d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.